

Wŏnhyo's Commentaries on the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*

By

Sung-bae Park

A.B. (Dongook University) 1958

M.A. (Dongook University) 1960

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Buddhist Studies

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Approved:

..... Lewis R. Lancaster 1-1-79
Chairman Date

..... Cyril B. Bink 1-4-79

..... T. W. Weiskopf 1-4-79

DEGREE CONFERRED JUNE 16, 1979

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Cyril Birch and Wei-ming Tu for their painstaking reading of this dissertation, and to Professor Lewis Lancaster, without whose constant encouragement and advice this dissertation would not have been made possible.

Abbreviations

<u>ABORI</u>	<u>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona)</u>
<u>AFM</u>	<u>The Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna</u>
<u>AFM-H</u>	Hakeda, Yoshito S., <u>The Awakening of Faith</u>
<u>AFM-S</u>	Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, <u>Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna</u>
<u>BB</u>	<u>Bibliographie Bouddhique</u>
<u>BDJ</u>	Mochizuki Shinkō, <u>Bukkyō daijiten</u>
<u>BKD</u>	Ono Gemmyō, <u>Bussho Kaisetsu daijiten</u>
<u>BMFJ</u>	<u>Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise</u>
<u>CE</u>	Combined Edition (<u>Taesŭng kishinnon so ki hoebon</u>)
<u>CHO</u>	Cho Myōng-gi, <u>Silla pulgyo ūi inyōm kwa yōksa</u>
<u>DKK-M</u>	Mochizuki Shinkō, <u>Daijō kishin ron no kenkyū</u>
<u>DKK-T</u>	Takemura Shōhō, <u>Daijō kishin ron kōdoku</u>
<u>DK-U</u>	Ui Hakuju, <u>Daijō kishin ron</u>
<u>EN</u>	Wōnhyo, Expository Notes (<u>Taesŭng kishinnon pyōlgi</u>)
<u>HBS</u>	<u>Han'guk pulgyo sasangsa</u>
<u>Hobo</u>	<u>Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopedique de Bouddhisme d'apres les sources chinoises et japonaises</u>
<u>HP-K</u>	Kim Yōng-t'ae, <u>Han'guk pulgyosa</u>

- IBK.....Indogaku bukkyogaku kenkyū
- IHQ.....Indian Historical Quarterly (Calcutta)
- JA.....Journal Asiatique (Paris)
- JAOS.....Journal of the American Oriental Society (Baltimore)
- JBORS.....Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society (Patna)
- K.....Koryō taejanggyōng
- KSL.....Chih-sheng, K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu
- Nara.....Ishida, ed., Narachō genzai issaikyōso mokuroku
- Nj.....Nanjiō Bunyiu., A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka
- OLZ.....Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
- RC.....Wōnhyo., Running Commentary (Taesūng kishinnonso)
- T.....Taishō shinshū daizōkyō
- WC.....Mok Chōngbae et al, Wōnhyo Chōnjip
- WKS.....Lee Chong-ik, Wōnhyo ūi kūnbon sasang
- Z.....Dainihon zokuzōkyō

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Abbreviations	ii
PART ONE	
Preface	2
I. Introduction	6
II. The Essence of the <u>Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun</u> . . .	26
III. Biography of Wonhyo	45
IV. Wonhyo's Bibliography	58
V. Wonhyo's Thought	73
VI. Conclusion	84
Notes to PART ONE	92
PART TWO	
I. Introduction to Translation	115
II. Translation	120
Notes to Translation	186
Appendix	250
Bibliography	253

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Abbreviations	ii
PART ONE	
Preface	2
I. Introduction	6
II. The Essence of the <u>Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun</u> . . .	26
III. Biography of Wonhyo	45
IV. Wonhyo's Bibliography	58
V. Wonhyo's Thought	73
VI. Conclusion	84
Notes to PART ONE	92
PART TWO	
I. Introduction to Translation	115
II. Translation	120
Notes to Translation	186
Appendix	250
Bibliography	253

Abbreviations

<u>ABORI</u>	<u>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona)</u>
<u>AFM</u>	<u>The Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna</u>
<u>AFM-H</u>	Hakeda, Yoshito S., <u>The Awakening of Faith</u>
<u>AFM-S</u>	Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, <u>Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna</u>
<u>BB</u>	<u>Bibliographie Bouddhique</u>
<u>BDJ</u>	Mochizuki Shinkō, <u>Bukkyō daijiten</u>
<u>BKD</u>	Ono Gemmyō, <u>Bussho Kaisetsu daijiten</u>
<u>BMFJ</u>	<u>Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise</u>
<u>CE</u>	Combined Edition (<u>Taesŭng kishinnon so ki hoebon</u>)
<u>CHO</u>	Cho Myōng-gi, <u>Silla pulgyo ūi inyōm kwa yōksa</u>
<u>DKK-M</u>	Mochizuki Shinkō, <u>Daijō kishin ron no kenkyū</u>
<u>DKK-T</u>	Takemura Shōhō, <u>Daijō kishin ron kōdoku</u>
<u>DK-U</u>	Ui Hakuju, <u>Daijō kishin ron</u>
<u>EN</u>	Wōnhyo, Expository Notes (<u>Taesŭng kishinnon pyōlgi</u>)
<u>HBS</u>	<u>Han'guk pulgyo sasangsa</u>
<u>Hobo</u>	<u>Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopedique de Bouddhisme d'apres les sources chinoises et japonaises</u>
<u>HP-K</u>	Kim Yōng-t'ae, <u>Han'guk pulgyosa</u>

The problem is compounded even further by the existence of one influential school of Buddhism, the Zen (Ch'an) school, not a few of whose teachers have openly insisted on the harmfulness of reading the scriptures for those intent on achieving Enlightenment. For these teachers and their followers, the scriptures might just as well be burned as read.³

This is not simply a modern problem; it existed in sixth century China.⁴ This was the period that saw the appearance of Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna (hereafter referred to as AFM). Once AFM appeared, it very quickly became popular. There seem to be two reasons for this: first, it satisfied the demand of people who wanted one volume that could comprehensively embrace all Buddhist doctrines; second, it is a non-sectarian text.⁵ As a matter of fact, AFM was welcomed not only by non-sectarian people but by sectarian people as well. This occasioned another problem: members of some Buddhist sects who welcomed the appearance of AFM tried to use AFM to glorify their own sects. Many of the traditional commentators betrayed such tendencies, the most famous of these being Fa-tsang (643-712 A.D.), the third patriarch of the Hua-yen school in China.⁶ One of his characteristic tactics was to anticipate the attack on his sectarian attitude by his opponents, the adherents of

- IBK.....Indogaku bukkyogaku kenkyū
- IHQ.....Indian Historical Quarterly (Calcutta)
- JA.....Journal Asiatique (Paris)
- JAOS.....Journal of the American Oriental Society (Baltimore)
- JBORS.....Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society (Patna)
- K.....Koryō taejanggyōng
- KSL.....Chih-sheng, K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu
- Nara.....Ishida, ed., Narachō genzai issaikyōso mokuroku
- Nj.....Nanjiō Bunyiu., A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka
- OLZ.....Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
- RC.....Wōnhyo., Running Commentary (Taesūng kishinnonso)
- T.....Taishō shinshū daizōkyō
- WC.....Mok Chōngbae et al, Wōnhyo Chōnjip
- WKS.....Lee Chong-ik, Wōnhyo ūi kūnbon sasang
- Z.....Dainihon zokuzōkyō

by which all sectarian disputes may be harmonized. According to Wŏnhyo's understanding, if one interprets AFM as a sectarian teaching, one will betray the original intent of its author.¹² Unfortunately, in East Asia, including his home country of Korea, Wŏnhyo's commentaries are simply famous; they are not well-studied.¹³ They have generally been neglected in favor of Fa-tsang's.

Wŏnhyo is, undoubtedly, one of the foremost thinkers that Korea has produced; he wrote much else besides his commentaries on AFM. Yet, although he influenced both Chinese and Japanese thinkers,¹⁴ he is almost unknown in the West. This thesis represents a preliminary attempt at remedying this situation.

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

falsity of the information about the author and translator as given by this colophon. Before entertaining Mochizuki's criticisms concerning the colophon, it would be best to review the previous traditional views about it.²⁰

The earliest text of the colophon appears in the thirteenth century edition of the Koryō Tripitaka, which was used as the basis of the Taishō Tripitaka.²¹ Sugi, the editor of the Koryō Tripitaka, was a very careful editor, but he did not mention anything about the colophon of AFM in the carefully written editorial record entitled Koryōguk shinjo Taejang kyojōng pyōllok 高麗國新雕大藏校正別錄, or Special Record of the Revisions of the Koryō Tripitaka.²²

The earliest record concerning the date of AFM is found in Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue entitled Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶紀, or Chronological Record of the Buddhist Scriptures. Fei's catalogue lists AFM as having been translated by Paramārtha in 550 A.D. at the residence of Lu Yüan-che, Fu-ch'un, China.²³ Fei Ch'ang-fang does not give the author's name. This does not mean, however, that Fei was skeptical about the identity of the author because Fei frequently failed to include author's names.²⁴ Another catalogue, Fa-ching lu or Fa-ching's Catalogue, which was presented to the Emperor Wen-ti of the Sui Dynasty in 594, also consis-

tently omits author's names.²⁵ Therefore, that these two catalogues do not mention Āśvaghoṣa as the author of AFM cannot count as evidence for disputing Āśvaghoṣa's authorship of AFM. In fact, it is much more reasonable to interpret their silence as a sign of their accepting Āśvaghoṣa's authorship, otherwise they would have indicated their doubts by placing AFM in the forged texts section of their catalogues. But they did not do so.

Fa-ching did, however, have doubts about Paramārtha's being the translator of AFM; thus he placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.²⁶ Fa-ching's reason is contained in the fifth volume of his Chung-ching mu-lu. It reads:

Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna. People say it is Paramārtha's translation. I checked the catalogue of Paramārtha's translations but it does not have this treatise. Therefore, I have put this text in the doubtful treatise section.

The full Chinese title of the doubtful treatise section is Chung-lun i-hu fen 衆論疑惑分, which means "section of all treatises which are doubtful." But, by putting AFM in this section Fa-ching demonstrated that he did not regard the treatise as a forgery, only that his investigations failed to uncover evidence to support the contention that Paramārtha was the translator; i.e., the Chen-ti lu 真諦錄, or Catalogue of Paramārtha's

Translations, which Fa-ching consulted simply did not contain AFM. Otherwise, he would have included it in the section reserved for forged treatises, the Chung-lun i-wang fen 衆論偽妄分, or "section of all treatises which are forged."²⁷ Therefore, Fa-ching's action cannot be construed as a negative judgment upon the authenticity of AFM.

How accurate was the copy of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted? There is absolutely no way to answer this question as no copies of the Chen-ti lu have survived.²⁸ But unless the quality of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted is ascertained, one cannot count Fa-ching's record as evidence in the authenticity debate. In any case, Fa-ching's catalogue was compiled by Fa-ching and twenty other people within the space of one year.²⁹ Because it was completed in such a short space of time the cataloguers based much of their information on previous records without checking them against the actual texts involved. This last feature of the Chen-ti lu makes Fa-ching's doubts concerning Paramārtha's having translated AFM lose much of their force.

In addition to Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching, a number of distinguished Buddhist scholars in the sixth century, such as the earliest commentator on AFM, T'an-yen (516-588), the T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i (539-597), the She-lun

master T'an-ch'ien (542-607) and the San-lun master Chi-tsang (549-623), made reference to AFM.³⁰ Neither these scholars nor the three great commentators on AFM, Hui-yüan (523-592), Wŏnhyo (617-686) and Fa-tsang (643-712) doubted Aśvaghoṣa's authorship.³¹ This being so, why did Mochizuki challenge their view?

According to Mochizuki, he himself had been an adherent of the traditional view and had blindly accepted the information contained in the colophon.³² He renounced the traditional view on discovering that Fa-ching had placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue. However, as indicated above, doubtful does not mean forged. Therefore, Mochizuki's reason is weak and unconvincing, and represents a careless reading of Fa-ching's catalogue.

Mochizuki's second reason revolves around the fact that different records give different dates for Paramārtha's translation. In the most voluminous of his books devoted to the authenticity question, Daijō kishin ron no kenkyū (A Study of the Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna), Mochizuki points out that (1) Fei Ch'ang-fang gives 550 A.D. as the translation date, (2) Fa-ching doubts that Paramārtha was the translator altogether, (3) Yen-tsung's catalogue (602 A.D.) says that AFM was translated during the Ch'en Dynasty, i.e., between 557 and 589 A.D., (4) Chih-k'ai's preface says 554 A.D., (5) Fa-tsang gives

the same reign year as Chih-k'ai but gives a different cyclical year, (6) Chih-sheng says 553 A.D. These facts constitute Mochizuki's second reason for doubting the authenticity of AFM.³³ However, his argument is once again weak and unconvincing.

First of all, it is necessary to point out that the discrepancies between the dates given by Chih-k'ai, Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng center on the fact that the reign year Chih-k'ai gives as the translation date (554 A.D.) does not tally with the cyclical year he gives (癸酉). Fa-tsang kept Chih-k'ai's reign year but gave the cyclical year (甲戌) properly corresponding to that reign year; Chih-sheng kept Chih-k'ai's cyclical year but gave the reign year (553 A.D.) properly corresponding to that cyclical year. Thus the difference between Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng with respect to Chih-k'ai reflect nothing more than an attempt to correct Chih-k'ai's mistake; in that sense the differences among them are trivial.³⁴

The differences among Fei-Ch'ang-fang, Yen-tsung and Chih-k'ai are less trivial. (Fa-ching's doubts have been discussed above). However, it is obvious that Chih-k'ai's preface is a forgery.³⁵ Thus, the date in the preface is unreliable. Second, Yen-tsung never explicitly stated that AFM was translated during the Ch'en Dynasty. Yen-tsung simply regarded Paramārtha as a Ch'en Dynasty monk.³⁶

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

First, it is well known that the early Chinese translators of Buddhist texts were not so faithful to the Sanskrit text that while translating they could not add to or deviate from the original, especially if they felt that by doing so the text would be better received. Thus, it is very conceivable that the elements in AFM which purportedly reflect Chinese views may have crept into AFM during the process of translation. Second, the Indian translators did not know Chinese well. Thus, they placed heavy reliance on their assistants who, however, did not know Sanskrit. As a result, a communication gap arose. When Paramārtha translated the AFM, he had been in China for only four years. Matters of terminology, style, even how best to present the doctrine in translating AFM were of necessity left in the hands of assistants. There is no evidence to suggest that Paramārtha used the same group of assistants for all his translations. Also, it is reasonable to suppose that as Paramārtha became more fluent in Chinese, he might have had a greater hand in choosing Chinese equivalents for Sanskrit terms. In this way, discrepancies between the style and terminology of AFM and those of Paramārtha's other translations can be explained.⁴⁰ Thus, here too, Mochizuki's argument is not compelling.

Mochizuki introduces various other reasons to support

his argument. We will not discuss them as they can be undermined as readily as the previous ones. However, we must examine Mochizuki's most serious attack on the authenticity of AFM. Mochizuki claimed that the AFM was a forgery because of its close resemblance to another famous forgery, the so-called Chan-ch'a shan-o yeh-pao-ching 占察善惡業報經 (hereafter referred to as Chan-ch'a ching), attributed to the translator Pu-ti-teng of the Sui Dynasty.⁴¹ After a thorough comparison of AFM and Chan-ch'a ching, Mochizuki concludes that AFM is a later, revised version of it. It is true that the books are amazingly similar in many ways. For example, the topics, their order, and their explanation are almost exactly the same. However, Mochizuki's argument again lends itself to criticism.

Mochizuki claims that because AFM is so precise, refined and comprehensive, while Chan-ch'a ching is imprecise, rough and not comprehensive, the latter is obviously earlier, because a precise work cannot become imprecise. This argument is open to the following objection. Both AFM and Chan-ch'a ching were popular in China in the latter part of the sixth century. In 593 A.D. the government prohibited Chan-ch'a ching from being circulated because it propagated false teachings such as divination.⁴² Therefore the catalogues of both

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

falsity of the information about the author and translator as given by this colophon. Before entertaining Mochizuki's criticisms concerning the colophon, it would be best to review the previous traditional views about it.²⁰

The earliest text of the colophon appears in the thirteenth century edition of the Koryō Tripitaka, which was used as the basis of the Taishō Tripitaka.²¹ Sugi, the editor of the Koryō Tripitaka, was a very careful editor, but he did not mention anything about the colophon of AFM in the carefully written editorial record entitled Koryōguk shinjo Taejang kyojōng pyōllok 高麗國新雕大藏校正別錄, or Special Record of the Revisions of the Koryō Tripitaka.²²

The earliest record concerning the date of AFM is found in Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue entitled Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶紀, or Chronological Record of the Buddhist Scriptures. Fei's catalogue lists AFM as having been translated by Paramārtha in 550 A.D. at the residence of Lu Yüan-che, Fu-ch'un, China.²³ Fei Ch'ang-fang does not give the author's name. This does not mean, however, that Fei was skeptical about the identity of the author because Fei frequently failed to include author's names.²⁴ Another catalogue, Fa-ching lu or Fa-ching's Catalogue, which was presented to the Emperor Wen-ti of the Sui Dynasty in 594, also consis-

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 信 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 信 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

hsin 信 and its objects when used as a transitive verb, namely, that the nature of faith in all twelve cases is that of assent to a propositional truth.

This conclusion is supported by Wŏnhyo.⁶⁰ When Wŏnhyo comments on the three passages discussed above he clearly states that the faith discussed in them belongs to the earliest, beginner's stage, which is only a prelude to the next stage, that of understanding and practice. As the title of AFM suggests, one of the most important issues it will raise is the issue of faith. Chapter Four of the text, "On Practicing Faith," is the chapter devoted to faith and practice, but the meaning of faith in this chapter and in the title are different.

Before examining this difference two things must be kept in mind about the nature of Chapter Four. First, this chapter was written for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth. Second, the primary purpose of this chapter is to instruct the reader in how to practice in order to enter the path of correct truth; its primary purpose is not to discuss what faith is.

The first sentence of Chapter Four supports our first point:

In this chapter practicing faith will be discussed for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth.⁶¹

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

falsity of the information about the author and translator as given by this colophon. Before entertaining Mochizuki's criticisms concerning the colophon, it would be best to review the previous traditional views about it.²⁰

The earliest text of the colophon appears in the thirteenth century edition of the Koryō Tripitaka, which was used as the basis of the Taishō Tripitaka.²¹ Sugi, the editor of the Koryō Tripitaka, was a very careful editor, but he did not mention anything about the colophon of AFM in the carefully written editorial record entitled Koryōguk shinjo Taejang kyojōng pyōllok 高麗國新雕大藏校正別錄, or Special Record of the Revisions of the Koryō Tripitaka.²²

The earliest record concerning the date of AFM is found in Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue entitled Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶紀, or Chronological Record of the Buddhist Scriptures. Fei's catalogue lists AFM as having been translated by Paramārtha in 550 A.D. at the residence of Lu Yüan-che, Fu-ch'un, China.²³ Fei Ch'ang-fang does not give the author's name. This does not mean, however, that Fei was skeptical about the identity of the author because Fei frequently failed to include author's names.²⁴ Another catalogue, Fa-ching lu or Fa-ching's Catalogue, which was presented to the Emperor Wen-ti of the Sui Dynasty in 594, also consis-

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 信 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 信 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

In contrast to these modern interpreters, traditional commentators always made this very clear.⁶⁷

Hakeda's translation concerning the second, third and fourth faiths suffers from exactly the same problem as his translation concerning the first faith. Suzuki's translation continues to support our contention. Concerning the second, third and fourth faiths Hakeda translates,

The second is the faith in the numberless excellent qualities of the Buddhas. Because [of this faith] a man comes to meditate on them always, to draw near to them in fellowship, to honor them, and to respect them, developing his capacity for goodness and seeking after the all-embracing knowledge. The third is the faith in the great benefits of the Dharma (Teaching). Because [of this faith] a man comes constantly to remember and practice various disciplines leading to enlightenment. The fourth is the faith in the Sangha (Buddhist Community) whose members are able to devote themselves to the practice of benefitting both themselves and others. Because [of this faith] a man comes to approach the assembly of Bodhisattvas constantly and with joy and to seek instruction from them in the correct practice.⁶⁸

In Hakeda's understanding, "the numberless excellent qualities of the Buddhas," "the great benefits of the Dharma," and "the Sangha" are the objects of "faith." As a result of these faiths, people are able to meditate on the Buddhas, practice the various dharmas, and approach the Saṅgha. If, however, these things result from faith, as Hakeda would have it, and if this is the meaning that

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

types of faith: the first type is seen throughout its first, second and third chapters, and includes the "faith" of the title of the text; the second type is seen at the beginning of Chapter Four, a discussion of which has occupied us above; the third type is seen at the end of Chapter Four and is the faith in Amitabha Buddha.⁷⁰ It is interesting to note the author's systematic arrangement whereby each type of faith receives a fair representation in the text in order to aid people of differing mental capacities. "Mental capacity" here does not mean intellectual capacity; it means the degree of receptivity to a religious teaching or principle. We use the adjective "mental" merely for the sake of convenience, but avoid the equally convenient "spiritual" because that term implies a closer connection between that to which we are here referring and that which is often designated "spirituality" in the West than the facts of Buddhist faith and practice warrant.

In AFM the author first discusses "utmost right faith" (正信) without any consideration of people's differing mental capacities. This discussion occupies the greater part of the text. Next, for those unable to grasp the first type of faith, i.e., the aniyata rasi, the author presents the second type of faith, which is elaborated in the famous four faiths and five practices theory in Chapter

Four. Finally for those unable to practice even the second type of faith, the author suggests nien-fo (念佛) or the recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, which enables birth in the Pure Land to take place. Backsliding in faith will never happen in the Pure Land because of the complete protection that Amitābha Buddha proffers.⁷¹ It is very ironic that in the later development of Chinese Buddhism, after the appearance of AFM in China in the sixth century A.D., the first type of faith never really became popular; instead, the third type became more and more popular as time went on. Surprisingly, this led even Ch'an Buddhists to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha as part of their daily service.⁷² Even more surprisingly, however, the first type of faith dealt with in AFM is now, in the twentieth century, being represented to the West as being of the same type as the third type of faith, without the confusion this involves having been pointed out.

If the second type of faith dealt with in AFM, the type of faith dealt with at the beginning of Chapter Four, may be characterized as assensus,⁷³ or assent, then the third type of faith, reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, may be characterized as fiducia,⁷⁴ or trust or loyalty. But the first type of faith, with which the first three chapters are mainly concerned, may be characterized neither

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

First, it is well known that the early Chinese translators of Buddhist texts were not so faithful to the Sanskrit text that while translating they could not add to or deviate from the original, especially if they felt that by doing so the text would be better received. Thus, it is very conceivable that the elements in AFM which purportedly reflect Chinese views may have crept into AFM during the process of translation. Second, the Indian translators did not know Chinese well. Thus, they placed heavy reliance on their assistants who, however, did not know Sanskrit. As a result, a communication gap arose. When Paramārtha translated the AFM, he had been in China for only four years. Matters of terminology, style, even how best to present the doctrine in translating AFM were of necessity left in the hands of assistants. There is no evidence to suggest that Paramārtha used the same group of assistants for all his translations. Also, it is reasonable to suppose that as Paramārtha became more fluent in Chinese, he might have had a greater hand in choosing Chinese equivalents for Sanskrit terms. In this way, discrepancies between the style and terminology of AFM and those of Paramārtha's other translations can be explained.⁴⁰ Thus, here too, Mochizuki's argument is not compelling.

Mochizuki introduces various other reasons to support

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

hsin 信 and its objects when used as a transitive verb, namely, that the nature of faith in all twelve cases is that of assent to a propositional truth.

This conclusion is supported by Wŏnhyo.⁶⁰ When Wŏnhyo comments on the three passages discussed above he clearly states that the faith discussed in them belongs to the earliest, beginner's stage, which is only a prelude to the next stage, that of understanding and practice. As the title of AFM suggests, one of the most important issues it will raise is the issue of faith. Chapter Four of the text, "On Practicing Faith," is the chapter devoted to faith and practice, but the meaning of faith in this chapter and in the title are different.

Before examining this difference two things must be kept in mind about the nature of Chapter Four. First, this chapter was written for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth. Second, the primary purpose of this chapter is to instruct the reader in how to practice in order to enter the path of correct truth; its primary purpose is not to discuss what faith is.

The first sentence of Chapter Four supports our first point:

In this chapter practicing faith will be discussed for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth.⁶¹

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 信 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 信 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

hsin 信 and its objects when used as a transitive verb, namely, that the nature of faith in all twelve cases is that of assent to a propositional truth.

This conclusion is supported by Wŏnhyo.⁶⁰ When Wŏnhyo comments on the three passages discussed above he clearly states that the faith discussed in them belongs to the earliest, beginner's stage, which is only a prelude to the next stage, that of understanding and practice. As the title of AFM suggests, one of the most important issues it will raise is the issue of faith. Chapter Four of the text, "On Practicing Faith," is the chapter devoted to faith and practice, but the meaning of faith in this chapter and in the title are different.

Before examining this difference two things must be kept in mind about the nature of Chapter Four. First, this chapter was written for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth. Second, the primary purpose of this chapter is to instruct the reader in how to practice in order to enter the path of correct truth; its primary purpose is not to discuss what faith is.

The first sentence of Chapter Four supports our first point:

In this chapter practicing faith will be discussed for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth.⁶¹

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

46. 瑜伽抄 (5), missing, Nara
 47. 中辺分別論疏 (4), extant: only roll 3, WC
 48. 辨中辺論疏 (4) missing, Nara
 49. 掌珍論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
 50. 掌珍論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2183
 51. 雜集論疏 (5), missing, T. 2183

Eleventh group -- On Nyāya

52. 因明論疏 (1), missing, T. 2184
 53. 判比量論 (1), extant: fragment, WC,
 pp. 285-300
 54. 判比量論跋文 extant, Z. 954
 55. 正理記 (1), missing, Kenjun
 56. 因明入正理論記 (1), missing, T. 2183

Twelfth group -- On Tathāgatagarbha

57. 不增不減經 (1), missing, T. 2184
 58. 勝鬘經疏 (2 or 4), missing, T. 2184,
 T. 2183
 59. 宝性論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2183
 60. 宝性論宗要 (1), missing, Nara
 61. 楞伽經疏 (7 or 8), missing, T. 2184,
Nara
 62. 入楞伽經疏 (7 or 8), missing, T. 145,
Nara

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

Disputes in Ten Chapters. The significance of this work will be discussed in the following section.

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

lifelong goals as the most prominent Buddhist of his time was to terminate all of those violent disputes. This is probably the reason why he and his followers found Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization so attractive. But it is strange that it is not possible to find a discussion of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization from Ŭich'ŏn. Unless hitherto unknown works by Ŭich'ŏn are unearthed, one can only conclude that either he was not a scholar, and so was not equipped to discuss Wŏnhyo's theory, or else he simply tried to realize Wŏnhyo's ideal through T'ien-t'ai doctrine, which harmonizes meditation and scriptural study.¹⁴²

Ŭich'ŏn was succeeded in championing the idea of harmonization by Chinul (1158-1210 A.D.), who greatly influenced the later development of Korean Buddhism. Chinul especially emphasized the unity of meditation and scriptural study. In this regard Chinul frequently quotes Wŏnhyo, but his purpose in quoting him is almost always restricted to showing Wŏnhyo as a scriptural scholar who practiced meditation, rather than as one who had already explicitly emphasized the unity of scriptural studies and meditation. Actually, Chinul is the Sŏn (Ch'an) master who skillfully changed the direction of Korean Buddhism from emphasis on scriptural studies to emphasis on the practice of Sŏn meditation.¹⁴³ So far no Chinul expert has discussed in detail Chinul's relationship to Wŏnhyo.¹⁴⁴

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

the same reign year as Chih-k'ai but gives a different cyclical year, (6) Chih-sheng says 553 A.D. These facts constitute Mochizuki's second reason for doubting the authenticity of AFM.³³ However, his argument is once again weak and unconvincing.

First of all, it is necessary to point out that the discrepancies between the dates given by Chih-k'ai, Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng center on the fact that the reign year Chih-k'ai gives as the translation date (554 A.D.) does not tally with the cyclical year he gives (癸酉). Fa-tsang kept Chih-k'ai's reign year but gave the cyclical year (甲戌) properly corresponding to that reign year; Chih-sheng kept Chih-k'ai's cyclical year but gave the reign year (553 A.D.) properly corresponding to that cyclical year. Thus the difference between Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng with respect to Chih-k'ai reflect nothing more than an attempt to correct Chih-k'ai's mistake; in that sense the differences among them are trivial.³⁴

The differences among Fei-Ch'ang-fang, Yen-tsung and Chih-k'ai are less trivial. (Fa-ching's doubts have been discussed above). However, it is obvious that Chih-k'ai's preface is a forgery.³⁵ Thus, the date in the preface is unreliable. Second, Yen-tsung never explicitly stated that AFM was translated during the Ch'en Dynasty. Yen-tsung simply regarded Paramārtha as a Ch'en Dynasty monk.³⁶

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

there is a hierarchical distinction made between the Absolute on one hand and the absolute and phenomena on the other. Although Hakeda never presents the issue of AFM in these terms, this understanding underlies his thinking.

Two recent doctoral dissertations from Harvard University discuss this issue; one was completed by Whalen Lai in 1975 and is entitled The Awakening of Faith in Mahayana;¹⁶⁴ the other was completed by Hee Sung Keel and is entitled Chinul, The Founder of Korean Sŏn (Zen) Tradition.¹⁶⁵ Both dissertations contain sizeable discussions about Wŏnhyo's understanding of AFM. Unfortunately, Whalen Lai holds more or less the same position as Hakeda. Lai fails to grasp the inseparability of the two aspects, as he claims that the absolute aspect creates the phenomenal aspect. Hee Sung Keel understands the relationship between the two aspects as dialectical. This contradicts the understanding derived from applying the T'i-yung formula, as the T'i-yung relationship is manifestly not a dialectical one. Furthermore, if one understands the two aspects in this way, one cannot understand expressions like "the impotence of language," which is not implied by dialectical thinking, or "the knowledge of the enlightened ones," which is not entertained by dialectical thinking. Yet expressions like these are used in AFM and Wŏnhyo's commentaries whenever the interdependence of the two aspects is discussed.¹⁶⁶

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

68. See AFM-H, pp. 92-93.

69. For the complete list of the six pāramitās, see the end of Chapter Three of AFM. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581a, lines 20-26.

70. The passage in AFM about Pure Land practice is found in T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 583a, lines 12-20. See also AFM-H, p. 102. The theory that holds that this passage is a later insertion can be rejected by adducing Wŏnhyo's understanding of AFM: (1) AFM is a systematic work in which all the existing theories are synthesized; (2) AFM is soteriological in purpose. See Takemura Shōhō's beautiful essay, which forms the appendix to his book Daijō kishin ron kōdoku, Kyoto: Hyakukaen, 1959, pp. 226-304.

71. For Wŏnhyo's Pure Land thought, see Sasaki Getsushō, Indo Shina Nihon jodokyō shi (Tokyo: Bōbunsha, 1928), pp. 451-484.

72. Some Korean Buddhists like Han Yong-un (1879-1944), one of the most influential Korean Buddhist leaders of the early twentieth century, severely criticized the practice of Pure Land in Korea because of its Sŏn (Zen) orientation. This criticism indicates that it was popular to practice Pure Land Buddhism in Korea even in Sŏn monasteries. See my paper, "Sŏn (Zen) and Pure Land in Korea," in the Pure Land volume of the

Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, edited by Dr. Michael Solomon (in press).

73. In Christian theology, "assensus" means a belief or mental assent to some truth. See Van A. Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 95-98.

74. Fiducia is understood to be the basic orientation of the total person. It may include belief, but it is best described as trust, confidence, or loyalty. See *ibid.*, p. 95.

75. For the three kinds of fa-hsin 發心, see AFM-H, pp. 80-91. See also T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 580b, line 15 - p. 581c, line 5.

76. The necessity of a ten thousand kalpas long practice for the perfection of faith is repeatedly emphasized in AFM. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 580b, line 22 and p. 580c, line 1.

77. This emphasis in AFM on long practice might be considered evidence of Hīnayāna notions of practice in AFM. But it is better to consider it as a reflection of the synthetic nature of AFM.

78. The possibility of metamorphosis from hsin-hsin to fa-hsin 發心 is debatable. However, in Buddhism such a transformation is always assumed by those who accept the possibility of Enlightenment. See Nagao Gadjin,

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通贊疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

142. See Park Chong-hong, Han'guk sasangsa, (Seoul: Sŏmundang, 1974), pp. 148-177.

143. See *ibid.*, pp. 178-232.

144. Even Professor Lee Chong-ik who wrote about Chinul for his doctoral dissertation in 1974 at Taishō University in Japan has not discussed the relationship between Wŏnhyo and Chinul.

145. "Pōjō Kuksa pimyŏng" or "The Inscription of National Master Pojo (Chinul)," written by Kim Kunsu in the thirteenth century, is the most detailed early record about Chinul but it does not yield any information about the relationship between Wŏnhyo and Chinul. Instead, it contains a lengthy description of the influence of Chinese monks on Chinul. See Kim Kunsu, "Pōjō Kuksa pimyŏng" in Pōjō pŏbŏ, translated by Kim T'anhŏ (Seoul: Pŏpŏwŏn, 1963), pp. 139-147.

146. See *ibid.*, p. 139b, line 11. See also Kim Chi-gyŏn, ed., Hwaŏmnon chŏryŏ (Tokyo: Seifū gakuen, 1968), p. 1, line 8.

147. It might be of interest here to point out that when Chinul did mention Wŏnhyo he always treated him as a representative of the scriptural study tradition and as a laymen. This is in marked contrast to Ŭich'ŏn's attitude towards Wŏnhyo. Both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul lived in the twelfth century, there being only fifty years

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

149. See Park Chong-hong, "Wŏnhyo ŭi ch'olhak sasang," in Han'guk sasangsa (Seoul: Sŏmundang, 1974), pp. 85-127.

150. See Keel, Hee Sŭng, Chinul, the founder of Korean Sŏn (Zen) tradition (Ph.D. thesis) (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1977), pp. 38-40. See also T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 202b, lines 18-23.

151. For Wŏnhyo's idea of interpenetration in his commentaries on AFM, see T. 1844, vol. 44, pp. 202a-b and T. 1845, vol. 44, p. 226a. See also Francis Cook, Hua-yen Buddhism (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977), pp. 56-89.

152. See T. 1845, vol. 44, p. 226b, lines 4-12.

153. Wŏnhyo's focus in his double negation is on having people elevate from aniyata rāśi to niyata rāśi. Therefore, Wŏnhyo's theory of double negation is used in his system as a theory of religious practice in which fa-hsin is achieved.

154. According to Wŏnhyo, AFM contains a good answer to the problem of how to realize interpenetration.

155. Keel, Hee Sung translated T'ong pulgyo as "unified Buddhism" in his thesis. If that were correct, however, it would be incompatible with Wŏnhyo's disinterest in institutional organizations. See his thesis, p. 42.

156. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575c, lines 20-24.

157. See *ibid.*, p. 576a, lines 5-7.

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

PART TWO

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

well. Where so much explanatory material is needed to clarify a sentence that its inclusion within parentheses would impair the readability of the sentence, that material is not included in the sentence and is not placed within parentheses. Instead, an explanation of the sentence is placed in a note. Notes are also used where my translation of AFM differs significantly from previous translations, and where it is necessary to justify the translation of a particular passage from Wŏnhyo's commentary because several different translations of that passage are possible.

Furthermore, it was sometimes found necessary to correct the original text itself, as certain passages are clearly corrupt, probably due to copyists' errors. For example, in line 7 of page 314-1a of the Zokuzōkyō edition, the character 離 li, "to depart," must be inserted between 若 che and 分 fen, otherwise the sentence makes no sense. Likewise, in line 9 of the same page the characters 不求 pu-chiu, "not to seek," must be inserted between 也 yeh and 名利 ming-li for the same reason.

Finally, a note on the format of this translation as it compares with the format of CE in Zokuzōkyō: in Zokuzōkyō, CE comprises pages of Chinese characters arranged vertically to form lines. Passages from AFM begin at the top of the page, RC is indented down the space of

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

Disputes in Ten Chapters. The significance of this work will be discussed in the following section.

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

in its) doctrine; when sealed, the principle of two aspects (in) One Mind (is found to be its) essence.⁵⁸ Within the two aspects are included myriad meanings without confusion. (These) limitless meanings are identical with One Mind and are completely amalgamated (with it). Therefore, (it) unfolds and seals freely; it establishes and refutes without restrictions. Unfolding but not complicating; sealing but not narrowing; establishing but gaining nothing; refuting but losing nothing -- this is Āśvaghoṣa's wonderful skill and the essence of On Awakening Faith.⁵⁹

However, the meaning of this treatise is so profound that interpreters hitherto have seldom presented its doctrine completely. Indeed, (this is) because since all of them were attached to what they had learned, they distorted the (meaning of the) sentences. Not able to abandon their preconceptions, still they sought the meaning. Therefore, (their interpretations) do not come close to the author's intent. Some hoped (to reach the) source but got lost in the streams; some grasped the leaves but forgot the trunk; some cut the collar and patched (it) to the sleeves; some broke the branches and grafted (them) to the roots. Now I (shall) directly correlate the sentences of this treatise with appropriate parts of the sūtras hoping (that my commentary) may provide some information to people on the same path.⁶⁰

"On Revealing the Essence of the Doctrine" ends.

II. On Explaining the Title⁶¹ (: TREATISE ON AWAKENING MAHĀYĀNA FAITH)⁶²

On the word "MAHĀYĀNA"

"Mahā" is a name representing the dharma; it means broadly containing.⁶³ "Yāna" is a simile which designates carrying. Although (this) is (valid) as a general explanation (of "Mahāyāna"), if one investigates (its meaning further one) finds two ways of doing it. The first is an explanation based on the sūtras; the second is a clarification based on the śāstras.

A. The Explanation Based on the Sūtras

As the Ākāśagarbha-sūtra⁶⁴ says,

Mahāyāna is so called because (it is) immeasurable, limitless and boundless, (because) it is ubiquitous, just as the simile of space (illustrates), because it is so broad and great that it accepts all sentient beings, and because it is not shared by Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. (Therefore, its) name is Mahāyāna.⁶⁵ Furthermore, as to yāna (vehicle), "Right Abiding in the Fourfold Comprehensive Practice of Accepting (all Sentient Beings)"⁶⁶ is the wheels (1); "Purifying Well the Tenfold Good Karmas"⁶⁷ is the spokes (2); "Purifying the Nourishment of Merit" is the hub (3); "Persistence, Purity and Concentration" is the tires, linch-pins, nails and cotter-pins (4);

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

6. (Buddha's) Enlightenment is said to be great because he attains immeasurable and innumerable great merits such as all of the Tathāgata's powers, fearlessness and the eighteen Buddha-dharmas not shared (by ordinary people); 7. (Buddha's) acts are said to be great because until the world of samsara is extinguished (Buddha, in) showing (himself) everywhere, (in) bringing about wisdom, etc., will perform all of Buddha's broad (and) great work.

(Explanation:) In the above, the first five are causes; the next two are effects.⁷⁷

Second, the Prakaraṇāryavāca-śāstra⁷⁸ says,

It is called Mahāyāna because the nature of Mahāyāna indicates the Bodhisattvayāna which perfectly corresponds to the seven kinds of greatness. What are the seven? (They are:) 1. the greatness of dharma, which refers to the expedient, broad, and great teaching included in the Bodhisattvapitaka of the twelve divisions (of the Buddhist canon);⁷⁹ 2. the greatness of generating (wisdom) mind, which means that the mind of Supreme and Perfect Enlightenment is already generated; 3. the greatness of excellent understanding, which indicates excellent faith and understanding in the greatness of the dharmas mentioned above; 4. the greatness of joyful mind, which means passing the stage of excellent understanding and practice (and) entering the joyful stage of pure and excellent mind;⁸⁰ 5. the greatness of nourishment: because of the achievement of the two kinds of nourishment--bliss (and) wisdom---Supreme Perfect Wisdom⁸¹ can be attained; 6. the greatness of time, which indicates that Supreme

Perfect Wisdom can be attained (at any time) during the three great incalculable aeons;⁸² 7. the greatness of the achievement (i.e., Perfect Enlightenment), which means that there is no comparison between the wisdom of Supreme Perfect Wisdom and wisdom achieved by other (means) --how could (the latter) excel the former?

Both the Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra⁸³ and the Bodhisattvabhūmi⁸⁴ (contain) explanations similar to this.

The Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra says,⁸⁵

Of these (seven kinds of greatness mentioned in the Prakaranāryavāca-sastra), the six kinds of greatness from the greatness of dharma to the greatness of time are the causes of the greatness of Perfect Enlightenment. The greatness of Perfect Enlightenment is the effect of the preceding six kinds of greatness.

Explanation: These two ways of grouping the seven kinds of greatness, although their numbers are identical, were established for different reasons. The reasons for their establishment, if sought, can be known.

The Explanation of Mahāyāna ends.

On the words "AWAKENING FAITH"

This treatise causes people's faith to be awakened, hence the words, "Awakening Faith." Faith is a term which indicates being certain. What is called (faith means) faith that the principle really exists,⁸⁶ faith that practice can get results, (and) faith that when

"On Revealing the Essence of the Doctrine" ends.

II. On Explaining the Title⁶¹ (: TREATISE ON AWAKENING MAHĀYĀNA FAITH)⁶²

On the word "MAHĀYĀNA"

"Mahā" is a name representing the dharma; it means broadly containing.⁶³ "Yāna" is a simile which designates carrying. Although (this) is (valid) as a general explanation (of "Mahāyāna"), if one investigates (its meaning further one) finds two ways of doing it. The first is an explanation based on the sūtras; the second is a clarification based on the śāstras.

A. The Explanation Based on the Sūtras

As the Ākāśagarbha-sūtra⁶⁴ says,

Mahāyāna is so called because (it is) immeasurable, limitless and boundless, (because) it is ubiquitous, just as the simile of space (illustrates), because it is so broad and great that it accepts all sentient beings, and because it is not shared by Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. (Therefore, its) name is Mahāyāna.⁶⁵ Furthermore, as to yāna (vehicle), "Right Abiding in the Fourfold Comprehensive Practice of Accepting (all Sentient Beings)"⁶⁶ is the wheels (1); "Purifying Well the Tenfold Good Karmas"⁶⁷ is the spokes (2); "Purifying the Nourishment of Merit" is the hub (3); "Persistence, Purity and Concentration" is the tires, linch-pins, nails and cotter-pins (4);

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

Buddha's way.¹²⁹

Sentient beings fall into the sea of life and death for so long and do not hasten to the shore of Nirvāṇa only because of doubts and wrong attachments. Therefore, the essence of (what is) here (meant by) saving sentient beings is causing (them) to eliminate (their) doubts and forsake (their) wrong attachments. (Although) there are many avenues (of approach) to a general discussion of doubt, two things (specifically) are doubted by those seeking Mahāyāna. The first is doubting the principle, which prevents the production of (wisdom) mind; the second is doubting the method, which prevents practice.

The words "doubting the principle" mean creating this doubt: is the essence of the principle of Mahāyāna one or many? If it is one, then no other principle exists. Because no other principle exists, then no sentient being exists.¹³⁰ (Then) for whose sake should the Bodhisattva make the great vow?¹³¹ If there are many principles, then there is not one essence. Because there is not one essence, the thing and I are separate (from) each (other). (Then) how can (one) get the great compassion (by which one regards others) as his own body to arise? Due to these doubts, (people) are unable to produce (wisdom) mind.

As to (what is meant by) saying "doubting the method," if the teaching method established by the Tathāgata is manifold, then according to which method should one

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

"On Revealing the Essence of the Doctrine" ends.

II. On Explaining the Title⁶¹ (: TREATISE ON AWAKENING MAHĀYĀNA FAITH)⁶²

On the word "MAHĀYĀNA"

"Mahā" is a name representing the dharma; it means broadly containing.⁶³ "Yāna" is a simile which designates carrying. Although (this) is (valid) as a general explanation (of "Mahāyāna"), if one investigates (its meaning further one) finds two ways of doing it. The first is an explanation based on the sūtras; the second is a clarification based on the śāstras.

A. The Explanation Based on the Sūtras

As the Ākāśagarbha-sūtra⁶⁴ says,

Mahāyāna is so called because (it is) immeasurable, limitless and boundless, (because) it is ubiquitous, just as the simile of space (illustrates), because it is so broad and great that it accepts all sentient beings, and because it is not shared by Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. (Therefore, its) name is Mahāyāna.⁶⁵ Furthermore, as to yāna (vehicle), "Right Abiding in the Fourfold Comprehensive Practice of Accepting (all Sentient Beings)"⁶⁶ is the wheels (1); "Purifying Well the Tenfold Good Karmas"⁶⁷ is the spokes (2); "Purifying the Nourishment of Merit" is the hub (3); "Persistence, Purity and Concentration" is the tires, linch-pins, nails and cotter-pins (4);

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

lifelong goals as the most prominent Buddhist of his time was to terminate all of those violent disputes. This is probably the reason why he and his followers found Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization so attractive. But it is strange that it is not possible to find a discussion of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization from Ŭich'ŏn. Unless hitherto unknown works by Ŭich'ŏn are unearthed, one can only conclude that either he was not a scholar, and so was not equipped to discuss Wŏnhyo's theory, or else he simply tried to realize Wŏnhyo's ideal through T'ien-t'ai doctrine, which harmonizes meditation and scriptural study.¹⁴²

Ŭich'ŏn was succeeded in championing the idea of harmonization by Chinul (1158-1210 A.D.), who greatly influenced the later development of Korean Buddhism. Chinul especially emphasized the unity of meditation and scriptural study. In this regard Chinul frequently quotes Wŏnhyo, but his purpose in quoting him is almost always restricted to showing Wŏnhyo as a scriptural scholar who practiced meditation, rather than as one who had already explicitly emphasized the unity of scriptural studies and meditation. Actually, Chinul is the Sŏn (Ch'an) master who skillfully changed the direction of Korean Buddhism from emphasis on scriptural studies to emphasis on the practice of Sŏn meditation.¹⁴³ So far no Chinul expert has discussed in detail Chinul's relationship to Wŏnhyo.¹⁴⁴

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

Four. Finally for those unable to practice even the second type of faith, the author suggests nien-fo (念佛) or the recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, which enables birth in the Pure Land to take place. Backsliding in faith will never happen in the Pure Land because of the complete protection that Amitābha Buddha proffers.⁷¹ It is very ironic that in the later development of Chinese Buddhism, after the appearance of AFM in China in the sixth century A.D., the first type of faith never really became popular; instead, the third type became more and more popular as time went on. Surprisingly, this led even Ch'an Buddhists to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha as part of their daily service.⁷² Even more surprisingly, however, the first type of faith dealt with in AFM is now, in the twentieth century, being represented to the West as being of the same type as the third type of faith, without the confusion this involves having been pointed out.

If the second type of faith dealt with in AFM, the type of faith dealt with at the beginning of Chapter Four, may be characterized as assensus,⁷³ or assent, then the third type of faith, reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, may be characterized as fiducia,⁷⁴ or trust or loyalty. But the first type of faith, with which the first three chapters are mainly concerned, may be characterized neither

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 信 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 信 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

in the six pairs, the voice) were to lose its tune, then (it would simply be) perfect; it would not be (one) voice. But in the present case (i.e., Buddha's) the tune is not destroyed yet (the voice) pervades (everything) equally; (the voice) does not stop pervading (everything equally) yet the rhyme (remains) distinct. Due to this principle (Buddha's voice) actually becomes perfect voice. This is not something to be fathomed by the thinking of the (ordinary) mind or consciousness because it is what is meant by the freedom of (Buddha's) Dharma body. Briefly speaking, this is what is meant by "one voice." But (let us) forego further discussion (of this point) and return (to the task of) interpreting the original sentences (of the treatise).¹⁶²

After this (i.e., the first part of the extensive explanation, clarifying the fact that when Buddha was in the world both teacher and audience were excellent,) the second part (of the extensive explanation begins,) clarifying the fact that after Buddha's death (people's) capacities and actions were different (than they were before). Concerning this fact (one can) specifically discover (people having) four kinds of capacity. The first two are those who obtain understanding through relying on the sūtras; the next two are those who rely on the treatises and then obtain understanding. The words, "are able by their own power to understand (the teaching) through

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

Perfect Wisdom can be attained (at any time) during the three great incalculable aeons;⁸² 7. the greatness of the achievement (i.e., Perfect Enlightenment), which means that there is no comparison between the wisdom of Supreme Perfect Wisdom and wisdom achieved by other (means) --how could (the latter) excel the former?

Both the Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra⁸³ and the Bodhisattvabhūmi⁸⁴ (contain) explanations similar to this.

The Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra says,⁸⁵

Of these (seven kinds of greatness mentioned in the Prakaranāryavāca-sastra), the six kinds of greatness from the greatness of dharma to the greatness of time are the causes of the greatness of Perfect Enlightenment. The greatness of Perfect Enlightenment is the effect of the preceding six kinds of greatness.

Explanation: These two ways of grouping the seven kinds of greatness, although their numbers are identical, were established for different reasons. The reasons for their establishment, if sought, can be known.

The Explanation of Mahāyāna ends.

On the words "AWAKENING FAITH"

This treatise causes people's faith to be awakened, hence the words, "Awakening Faith." Faith is a term which indicates being certain. What is called (faith means) faith that the principle really exists,⁸⁶ faith that practice can get results, (and) faith that when

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

are fused with each other; (their) boundaries are indistinguishable. Therefore, each of them without exception completely embraces all dharmas of principle and phenomena. Hence the words, "(It signifies that these) two aspects are inseparable from one another."

Question:¹⁹⁵ If each of these two aspects embraces both principle and phenomena, why then in the aspect of Suchness is only the essence of Mahāyāna shown, while in the aspect of arising and ceasing all (three)--the essence, attributes and operation (of Mahāyāna)--are shown?

Answer: The meanings of "embracing" and "showing" are different. Why? The aspect of Suchness (functions) to obliterate the attributes so as to manifest the principle. But the obliterated attributes are not eliminated; therefore, (the aspect of Suchness) is able to embrace the attributes. (Nevertheless,) the obliterated attributes are not present; therefore, the attributes (of Mahāyāna) are not shown (in the aspect of Suchness). (On the other hand,) the aspect of arising and ceasing (functions) to grasp the principle so as to perfect phenomena. (But since) grasping the principle does not destroy (the principle, the aspect of arising and ceasing) is able to embrace the principle. (However,) grasping the principle does not obliterate (the principle); therefore, (the aspect of arising and ceasing) also shows the essence (of Mahāyāna).¹⁹⁶

Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, edited by Dr. Michael Solomon (in press).

73. In Christian theology, "assensus" means a belief or mental assent to some truth. See Van A. Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 95-98.

74. Fiducia is understood to be the basic orientation of the total person. It may include belief, but it is best described as trust, confidence, or loyalty. See *ibid.*, p. 95.

75. For the three kinds of fa-hsin 發心, see AFM-H, pp. 80-91. See also T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 580b, line 15 - p. 581c, line 5.

76. The necessity of a ten thousand kalpas long practice for the perfection of faith is repeatedly emphasized in AFM. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 580b, line 22 and p. 580c, line 1.

77. This emphasis in AFM on long practice might be considered evidence of Hīnayāna notions of practice in AFM. But it is better to consider it as a reflection of the synthetic nature of AFM.

78. The possibility of metamorphosis from hsin-hsin to fa-hsin 發心 is debatable. However, in Buddhism such a transformation is always assumed by those who accept the possibility of Enlightenment. See Nagao Gadjin,

and conditions of all dharmas unite there is arising and ceasing. But although these two natures (i.e., differentiatedness and dependence) are not one, nevertheless, they are not different either. Why? All arising and ceasing dharmas produced by causes and conditions are inseparable from illusory thinking; as a result, they are differentiated (from one another). Therefore, differentiatedness does not differ from dependence; (it,) too, exists in the aspect of arising and ceasing. Furthermore, the arising of causes and conditions cannot be produced by the self, by others, or all together. Therefore, dependence does not differ from differentiatedness; (it,) too, exists in the aspect of Suchness.¹⁹⁸

(But) although these two natures (i.e., differentiatedness and dependence) are not different, nevertheless, they are not one either. Why? The principle of differentiatedness is not originally something, but nothing. (On the other hand,) although the principle of dependence is not something, nevertheless, it is not nothing either. Therefore, the two natures are likewise not contradictory. As the Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra says,¹⁹⁹ "the three natures"²⁰⁰ are interdependent; therefore, they are neither different nor the same." (The two natures) should (also) be so explained. If one is able to understand the meaning of these three natures' being neither one nor different, there will be nothing unresolved in the disputes of all

II. The Essence of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun

1

If one translates "Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun" 大乘起信論 as "Treatise" or "Discourse" on the "Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna," as previous translators have done,⁵⁰ one question immediately presents itself: Can ta-ch'eng, or "Mahāyāna," really be the object of ch'i-hsin, or "awakening faith," as the English translation implies? This question requires a lengthy discussion before an answer may be reached because the question involves the Buddhist concept of faith about which Buddhists themselves sometimes disagree.⁵¹ In fact, sometimes a single individual will experience the meaning of faith differently according to his degree of practice. But no matter how complex this subject is, one cannot escape confronting this question so long as one is dealing with the Buddhist conception of faith, as AFM is.⁵² Therefore, we must point out that in taking ta-ch'eng 大乘 as the object of ch'i-hsin 起信, that is, in taking Mahāyāna as the object of Buddhist faith, one runs the grave risk of misleading the English reader as to what Buddhist faith really is.

Our criterion for examining the correctness of the previous English translations will be the text itself, as well as the commentaries on it. Let us begin by noting

tently omits author's names.²⁵ Therefore, that these two catalogues do not mention Āśvaghoṣa as the author of AFM cannot count as evidence for disputing Āśvaghoṣa's authorship of AFM. In fact, it is much more reasonable to interpret their silence as a sign of their accepting Āśvaghoṣa's authorship, otherwise they would have indicated their doubts by placing AFM in the forged texts section of their catalogues. But they did not do so.

Fa-ching did, however, have doubts about Paramārtha's being the translator of AFM; thus he placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.²⁶ Fa-ching's reason is contained in the fifth volume of his Chung-ching mu-lu. It reads:

Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna. People say it is Paramārtha's translation. I checked the catalogue of Paramārtha's translations but it does not have this treatise. Therefore, I have put this text in the doubtful treatise section.

The full Chinese title of the doubtful treatise section is Chung-lun i-hu fen 衆論疑惑分, which means "section of all treatises which are doubtful." But, by putting AFM in this section Fa-ching demonstrated that he did not regard the treatise as a forgery, only that his investigations failed to uncover evidence to support the contention that Paramārtha was the translator; i.e., the Chen-ti lu 真諦錄, or Catalogue of Paramārtha's

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

Notes to Translation

1. Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith is how we have chosen to translate the title of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun 大乘起信論 (hereafter referred to as AFM). This is in contrast to all previously published translations of this text--D.T. Suzuki's, Timothy Richard's, Wai-tao's, and Yoshito Hakeda's. However, we believe that our translation better reflects Wŏnhyo's understanding of the relationship between Mahāyāna and awakening faith, as stated in section two of Part One.

2. A combined edition is a text in which two or more texts are combined. Three texts have been combined here: AFM (T. 1666), Wŏnhyo's Running Commentary (T. 1844), and Wŏnhyo's Expository Notes (T. 1845). The order followed in the intercalation of the commentaries is in strict accord with the order of the text in T. 1666. All of the Running Commentary is included in this edition, but overlapping parts of the Expository Notes have been omitted. The editor of the Combined Edition (hereafter referred to as CE) has never been identified.

3. Running Commentary is our translation of the title of Wŏnhyo's Ki-shin-non so 起信論疏 (T. 1844), which may more literally be translated as Commentary on Awakening Faith. This commentary is commonly referred

hsin 信 and its objects when used as a transitive verb, namely, that the nature of faith in all twelve cases is that of assent to a propositional truth.

This conclusion is supported by Wŏnhyo.⁶⁰ When Wŏnhyo comments on the three passages discussed above he clearly states that the faith discussed in them belongs to the earliest, beginner's stage, which is only a prelude to the next stage, that of understanding and practice. As the title of AFM suggests, one of the most important issues it will raise is the issue of faith. Chapter Four of the text, "On Practicing Faith," is the chapter devoted to faith and practice, but the meaning of faith in this chapter and in the title are different.

Before examining this difference two things must be kept in mind about the nature of Chapter Four. First, this chapter was written for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth. Second, the primary purpose of this chapter is to instruct the reader in how to practice in order to enter the path of correct truth; its primary purpose is not to discuss what faith is.

The first sentence of Chapter Four supports our first point:

In this chapter practicing faith will be discussed for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth.⁶¹

falsity of the information about the author and translator as given by this colophon. Before entertaining Mochizuki's criticisms concerning the colophon, it would be best to review the previous traditional views about it.²⁰

The earliest text of the colophon appears in the thirteenth century edition of the Koryō Tripitaka, which was used as the basis of the Taishō Tripitaka.²¹ Sugi, the editor of the Koryō Tripitaka, was a very careful editor, but he did not mention anything about the colophon of AFM in the carefully written editorial record entitled Koryōguk shinjo Taejang kyojōng pyōllok 高麗國新雕大藏校正別錄, or Special Record of the Revisions of the Koryō Tripitaka.²²

The earliest record concerning the date of AFM is found in Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue entitled Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶紀, or Chronological Record of the Buddhist Scriptures. Fei's catalogue lists AFM as having been translated by Paramārtha in 550 A.D. at the residence of Lu Yüan-che, Fu-ch'un, China.²³ Fei Ch'ang-fang does not give the author's name. This does not mean, however, that Fei was skeptical about the identity of the author because Fei frequently failed to include author's names.²⁴ Another catalogue, Fa-ching lu or Fa-ching's Catalogue, which was presented to the Emperor Wen-ti of the Sui Dynasty in 594, also consis-

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通贊疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

Translations, which Fa-ching consulted simply did not contain AFM. Otherwise, he would have included it in the section reserved for forged treatises, the Chung-lun i-wang fen 衆論偽妄分, or "section of all treatises which are forged."²⁷ Therefore, Fa-ching's action cannot be construed as a negative judgment upon the authenticity of AFM.

How accurate was the copy of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted? There is absolutely no way to answer this question as no copies of the Chen-ti lu have survived.²⁸ But unless the quality of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted is ascertained, one cannot count Fa-ching's record as evidence in the authenticity debate. In any case, Fa-ching's catalogue was compiled by Fa-ching and twenty other people within the space of one year.²⁹ Because it was completed in such a short space of time the cataloguers based much of their information on previous records without checking them against the actual texts involved. This last feature of the Chen-ti lu makes Fa-ching's doubts concerning Paramārtha's having translated AFM lose much of their force.

In addition to Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching, a number of distinguished Buddhist scholars in the sixth century, such as the earliest commentator on AFM, T'an-yen (516-588), the T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i (539-597), the She-lun

and every dharma; 3. the unlimited ability to explain each and every dharma and its meaning via any mode of written expression; 4. the unlimited ability to explain each and every dharma and its meaning via any mode of verbal expression. For a further discussion of this concept, see Ta-chih-tu-lun, Roll 25 (T. 1509, vol. 25, p. 246a-c) and Mochizuki, BDJ, vol. 3, p. 2020a-c.

16. If one is told that the essence of Mahāyāna is in the world of myriad phenomena and in the conversation of the people, then one expects it to be visible and describable. But that is a false expectation. In fact, no matter how wonderful one's faculties are, one cannot perceive the form of the essence of Mahāyāna nor can one describe its shape. Therefore, being beyond the apprehension of human faculties, the essence of Mahāyāna must remain invisible and indescribable.

17. The original of this sentence in RC differs from that in EN. RC reads

引之於有 一如用之而空
獲之於無 萬物乘之而生

A literal translation of this would be: "One might try to lead it into Being; however, everything is empty because of it. One might try to get it out of Non-being, but a myriad things arise through it." But EN reads

將謂有耶 一如由之而空
將謂無耶 萬物用之而生

and conditions of all dharmas unite there is arising and ceasing. But although these two natures (i.e., differentiatedness and dependence) are not one, nevertheless, they are not different either. Why? All arising and ceasing dharmas produced by causes and conditions are inseparable from illusory thinking; as a result, they are differentiated (from one another). Therefore, differentiatedness does not differ from dependence; (it,) too, exists in the aspect of arising and ceasing. Furthermore, the arising of causes and conditions cannot be produced by the self, by others, or all together. Therefore, dependence does not differ from differentiatedness; (it,) too, exists in the aspect of Suchness.¹⁹⁸

(But) although these two natures (i.e., differentiatedness and dependence) are not different, nevertheless, they are not one either. Why? The principle of differentiatedness is not originally something, but nothing. (On the other hand,) although the principle of dependence is not something, nevertheless, it is not nothing either. Therefore, the two natures are likewise not contradictory. As the Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra says,¹⁹⁹ "the three natures"²⁰⁰ are interdependent; therefore, they are neither different nor the same." (The two natures) should (also) be so explained. If one is able to understand the meaning of these three natures' being neither one nor different, there will be nothing unresolved in the disputes of all

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 信 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 信 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通鑽疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

Four. Finally for those unable to practice even the second type of faith, the author suggests nien-fo (念佛) or the recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, which enables birth in the Pure Land to take place. Backsliding in faith will never happen in the Pure Land because of the complete protection that Amitābha Buddha proffers.⁷¹ It is very ironic that in the later development of Chinese Buddhism, after the appearance of AFM in China in the sixth century A.D., the first type of faith never really became popular; instead, the third type became more and more popular as time went on. Surprisingly, this led even Ch'an Buddhists to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha as part of their daily service.⁷² Even more surprisingly, however, the first type of faith dealt with in AFM is now, in the twentieth century, being represented to the West as being of the same type as the third type of faith, without the confusion this involves having been pointed out.

If the second type of faith dealt with in AFM, the type of faith dealt with at the beginning of Chapter Four, may be characterized as assensus,⁷³ or assent, then the third type of faith, reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, may be characterized as fiducia,⁷⁴ or trust or loyalty. But the first type of faith, with which the first three chapters are mainly concerned, may be characterized neither

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

Hwaōmgyōng so 華嚴經疏: Hua-yen-ching su or "A Commentary on the Avatamsaka-sūtra" in ten rolls has survived. T. 2757, vol. 85, pp. 234c-236a represents the contents of the third roll; Wōnhyo chōnjip, edited by Pulgyohak tong'inhoe, has both the contents of the third roll as well as the preface to the whole commentary (ibid., pp. 73-79).

52. Two texts in Taishō bear the name Ying-lo ching: (1) P'u-sa ying-lo ching 菩薩瓔珞經 (T. 656, vol. 16, pp. 1-126) and (2) P'u sa ying-lo pen-yeh ching 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (T. 1485, vol. 24, pp. 1010b-1023a). Thus it is impossible to determine which Ying-lo ching is meant simply on the basis of the title Wōnhyo gives. However, as Wōnhyo wrote a commentary on T. 1485, it might be reasonable to assume that that is the text meant. Moreover, although T. 1485 belongs to the Vinaya section of the Tripiṭaka, it discusses the four stages doctrine as does the Avatamsaka-sūtra. For Wōnhyo's commentary on the P'u-sa ying-lo pen-yeh ching see Wōnhyo chōnjip, pp. 131-169.

53. The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāpr: Āpāramitā-sūtra has been translated into Chinese several times, by Mokṣala (T. 221, vol. 8, pp. 1-146), by Dharmarakṣa (T. 222, vol. 8, pp. 147-216), by Kumārajīva (T. 223, vol. 8, pp. 217-424) and by Hsüan-tsang (T. 220, vol. 7,

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

7. in the 34th case, where the object is ken-pen or "the Ultimate Source;"
8. in the 35th case, where the object is the fact that "the Buddha has immeasurable merits;"
9. in the 36th case, where the object is the fact that "the Dharma brings great benefits;"
10. in the 37th case, where the object is the fact that "the Saṅgha is able to practice correctly the ideal of benefitting both the self and others;"
11. in the 49th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise;"
12. in the 50th case, where the object is "the teaching which is expounded in the treatise."

In nine of these twelve cases (nos. 13, 16, 22, 28, 35, 36, 37, 49, 50), hsin 心 has a noun clause as its object; in the remaining three cases (nos. 12, 18, 34), hsin 心 has a simple noun as its object. What is the difference between these two categories?

The noun clauses which function as objects in the first category all have a common feature unique to them, namely, they all contain explanatory teachings about the Buddhist truth. Thus, the nature of the object in those cases is something to be realized rather than something simply to be believed in. In the second category, however, the simple nouns functioning as objects do seem to

Four. Finally for those unable to practice even the second type of faith, the author suggests nien-fo (念佛) or the recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, which enables birth in the Pure Land to take place. Backsliding in faith will never happen in the Pure Land because of the complete protection that Amitābha Buddha proffers.⁷¹ It is very ironic that in the later development of Chinese Buddhism, after the appearance of AFM in China in the sixth century A.D., the first type of faith never really became popular; instead, the third type became more and more popular as time went on. Surprisingly, this led even Ch'an Buddhists to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha as part of their daily service.⁷² Even more surprisingly, however, the first type of faith dealt with in AFM is now, in the twentieth century, being represented to the West as being of the same type as the third type of faith, without the confusion this involves having been pointed out.

If the second type of faith dealt with in AFM, the type of faith dealt with at the beginning of Chapter Four, may be characterized as assensus,⁷³ or assent, then the third type of faith, reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, may be characterized as fiducia,⁷⁴ or trust or loyalty. But the first type of faith, with which the first three chapters are mainly concerned, may be characterized neither

Translations, which Fa-ching consulted simply did not contain AFM. Otherwise, he would have included it in the section reserved for forged treatises, the Chung-lun i-wang fen 衆論偽妄分, or "section of all treatises which are forged."²⁷ Therefore, Fa-ching's action cannot be construed as a negative judgment upon the authenticity of AFM.

How accurate was the copy of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted? There is absolutely no way to answer this question as no copies of the Chen-ti lu have survived.²⁸ But unless the quality of the Chen-ti lu which Fa-ching consulted is ascertained, one cannot count Fa-ching's record as evidence in the authenticity debate. In any case, Fa-ching's catalogue was compiled by Fa-ching and twenty other people within the space of one year.²⁹ Because it was completed in such a short space of time the cataloguers based much of their information on previous records without checking them against the actual texts involved. This last feature of the Chen-ti lu makes Fa-ching's doubts concerning Paramārtha's having translated AFM lose much of their force.

In addition to Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching, a number of distinguished Buddhist scholars in the sixth century, such as the earliest commentator on AFM, T'an-yen (516-588), the T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i (539-597), the She-lun

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

and every dharma; 3. the unlimited ability to explain each and every dharma and its meaning via any mode of written expression; 4. the unlimited ability to explain each and every dharma and its meaning via any mode of verbal expression. For a further discussion of this concept, see Ta-chih-tu-lun, Roll 25 (T. 1509, vol. 25, p. 246a-c) and Mochizuki, BDJ, vol. 3, p. 2020a-c.

16. If one is told that the essence of Mahāyāna is in the world of myriad phenomena and in the conversation of the people, then one expects it to be visible and describable. But that is a false expectation. In fact, no matter how wonderful one's faculties are, one cannot perceive the form of the essence of Mahāyāna nor can one describe its shape. Therefore, being beyond the apprehension of human faculties, the essence of Mahāyāna must remain invisible and indescribable.

17. The original of this sentence in RC differs from that in EN. RC reads

引之於有 一如用之而空
獲之於無 萬物乘之而生

A literal translation of this would be: "One might try to lead it into Being; however, everything is empty because of it. One might try to get it out of Non-being, but a myriad things arise through it." But EN reads

將謂有耶 一如由之而空
將謂無耶 萬物用之而生

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

Notes to Translation

1. Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith is how we have chosen to translate the title of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun 大乘起信論 (hereafter referred to as AFM). This is in contrast to all previously published translations of this text--D.T. Suzuki's, Timothy Richard's, Wai-tao's, and Yoshito Hakeda's. However, we believe that our translation better reflects Wŏnhyo's understanding of the relationship between Mahāyāna and awakening faith, as stated in section two of Part One.

2. A combined edition is a text in which two or more texts are combined. Three texts have been combined here: AFM (T. 1666), Wŏnhyo's Running Commentary (T. 1844), and Wŏnhyo's Expository Notes (T. 1845). The order followed in the intercalation of the commentaries is in strict accord with the order of the text in T. 1666. All of the Running Commentary is included in this edition, but overlapping parts of the Expository Notes have been omitted. The editor of the Combined Edition (hereafter referred to as CE) has never been identified.

3. Running Commentary is our translation of the title of Wŏnhyo's Ki-shin-non so 起信論疏 (T. 1844), which may more literally be translated as Commentary on Awakening Faith. This commentary is commonly referred

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

and Fa-tsang (T. 1846, vol. 44, p. 247b, lines 25f)--modern Japanese scholars, such as Takemura Shōhō (Daijō kishinron kōdoku, Kyoto: Hyakukaen, 1959, p. 13) and Ui Hakuju (Daijō kishonron, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1936, p. 98) follow Fa-tsang--Wōnhyo seems to want to emphasize human beings, because the Saṅgha is a human community. However, not to mislead his readers into thinking that human beings are thereby confirmed in their ordinary condition, Wōnhyo points to the Daśabhūmika Bodhisattvas (see note 120), who had reached a certain stage of practice, as the example of what the Saṅgha is. See note 112.

120. Daśabhūmika Bodhisattvas are Bodhisattvas who are at the Shih-ti 十地 stage, the last group of ten stages in the fifty-two stage process of becoming a Buddha. The fifty-two stages are:

- 1-10: the stage of ten faiths, shih-hsin 十信;
- 11-20: the stage of ten dwellings, shih-chu 十住;
- 21-30: the stage of ten conducts, shih-hsing 十行;
- 31-40: the stage of ten returns, shih-hui-hsiang 十迴向;
- 41-50: the stage of ten bhūmi, shih-ti 十地;
- 51: the stage of Identical Enlightenment, teng-chüeh 等覺;
- 52: the stage of Marvelous Enlightenment, miao-chüeh 妙覺.

See Mochizuki, BDJ, Vol. 2, pp. 1214a-1217a. See also Garma C.C. Chang, The Buddhist Teaching of Totality (University Park, Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974), pp. 28-47.

121. By saying this Wonhyo clearly shows that he maintains the position that the possibility of having such limitless virtue is open to everybody, yet, in fact, such virtues belong only to Bodhisattvas.

122. This is also called the Ratnagotravibhāga-mahāyānottara tantra-sāstra 究竟一乘宝性論, translated into Chinese by Ratnamati. See T. 1611, vol. 31, pp. 813-848. The most recent and comprehensive treatment of this text is that by the famous expert on Tathagatagarbha thought, Takasaki Jikido, entitled A Study of the Ratnagotravibhaga (Uttarantantra), being a treatise on the Tathagatagarbha Theory of Mahayana Buddhism, Rome, 1966.

123. The term 正體智, translated here as "right essential wisdom," is also called "fundamental wisdom" (mūlajñāna; 根本智), or the "non-discriminating wisdom of pure intuition" (nirvikalpajñāna; 無分別智).

124. The term 後得智 (prṣṭhalabdhajñāna), which could also be translated "subsequent wisdom," means the wisdom obtained after the fundamental wisdom (根本智) is obtained. This wisdom is wisdom applied to worldly

hsin 信 and its objects when used as a transitive verb, namely, that the nature of faith in all twelve cases is that of assent to a propositional truth.

This conclusion is supported by Wŏnhyo.⁶⁰ When Wŏnhyo comments on the three passages discussed above he clearly states that the faith discussed in them belongs to the earliest, beginner's stage, which is only a prelude to the next stage, that of understanding and practice. As the title of AFM suggests, one of the most important issues it will raise is the issue of faith. Chapter Four of the text, "On Practicing Faith," is the chapter devoted to faith and practice, but the meaning of faith in this chapter and in the title are different.

Before examining this difference two things must be kept in mind about the nature of Chapter Four. First, this chapter was written for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth. Second, the primary purpose of this chapter is to instruct the reader in how to practice in order to enter the path of correct truth; its primary purpose is not to discuss what faith is.

The first sentence of Chapter Four supports our first point:

In this chapter practicing faith will be discussed for the sake of people who have not yet definitely resolved to pursue the truth.⁶¹

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

Fei Ch'ang-fang and Fa-ching treat Chan'ch'a ching as a forgery. So did Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng.⁴³ These Buddhist cataloguers were all great scholars. Chih-sheng, especially, was brilliant and sensitive in distinguishing between forged and true scripture. But while he condemned Chan-ch'a ching as a forgery, he had nothing but praise for AFM. He even went so far as to criticize Fa-ching for having placed AFM in the doubtful texts section of his catalogue.⁴⁴ If, as Mochizuki pointed out, AFM and Chan-ch'a ching so closely resemble each other, then Chih-sheng showed a surprising ambivalence in his treatment of the two texts.

But on examining the present text of Chan-ch'a ching, one easily notices a difference between the first and second rolls. As a matter of fact, they resemble two completely different texts. There is no connection between them at all, for while the first roll is entirely devoted to divination, the second roll closely resembles AFM. But a question immediately arises as to why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng failed to point out this striking difference between the first and second rolls. The most plausible explanation is that the contents of the second roll of Chan-ch'a ching did not resemble AFM until after Chih-sheng's time; i.e., the original second roll was replaced by the second roll in its present form.

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

(Running Commentary)

(CONTENT ANALYSIS)

(The words,) "is in five chapters" refer to the number of chapters. After (the words,) "what are the five?" the names of the chapters are enumerated.

On (the first) chapter, "On Reasons (for Writing the Treatise)"

Without reasons, one (can)not begin (writing) a treatise, because the wise man must of necessity know first what is to be done (before he may do it).

On (the second) chapter, "On Establishing (what Mahāyāna) Means"

When reasons (for writing) have been stated, (one) should (then proceed to) establish the right meaning, because until (the meaning) has been definitively established, the essence of a doctrine cannot be known.

On (the third) chapter, "The Explanation (of the Principle of Mahāyāna)"

Once a doctrine has been precisely established, it must be followed by a comprehensive explanation, because where an explanation is lacking, meaning and principle are difficult to understand.

On (the fourth) chapter, "On Practicing Faith"

Based on the explanation (of the principle of Mahāyāna) faith will arise; (this faith) must (then) be put into practice, because to have understanding without practice is not in accord with the intent of (this) treatise.

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

Four. Finally for those unable to practice even the second type of faith, the author suggests nien-fo (念佛) or the recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, which enables birth in the Pure Land to take place. Backsliding in faith will never happen in the Pure Land because of the complete protection that Amitābha Buddha proffers.⁷¹ It is very ironic that in the later development of Chinese Buddhism, after the appearance of AFM in China in the sixth century A.D., the first type of faith never really became popular; instead, the third type became more and more popular as time went on. Surprisingly, this led even Ch'an Buddhists to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha as part of their daily service.⁷² Even more surprisingly, however, the first type of faith dealt with in AFM is now, in the twentieth century, being represented to the West as being of the same type as the third type of faith, without the confusion this involves having been pointed out.

If the second type of faith dealt with in AFM, the type of faith dealt with at the beginning of Chapter Four, may be characterized as assensus,⁷³ or assent, then the third type of faith, reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, may be characterized as fiducia,⁷⁴ or trust or loyalty. But the first type of faith, with which the first three chapters are mainly concerned, may be characterized neither

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

the same reign year as Chih-k'ai but gives a different cyclical year, (6) Chih-sheng says 553 A.D. These facts constitute Mochizuki's second reason for doubting the authenticity of AFM.³³ However, his argument is once again weak and unconvincing.

First of all, it is necessary to point out that the discrepancies between the dates given by Chih-k'ai, Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng center on the fact that the reign year Chih-k'ai gives as the translation date (554 A.D.) does not tally with the cyclical year he gives (癸酉). Fa-tsang kept Chih-k'ai's reign year but gave the cyclical year (甲戌) properly corresponding to that reign year; Chih-sheng kept Chih-k'ai's cyclical year but gave the reign year (553 A.D.) properly corresponding to that cyclical year. Thus the difference between Fa-tsang and Chih-sheng with respect to Chih-k'ai reflect nothing more than an attempt to correct Chih-k'ai's mistake; in that sense the differences among them are trivial.³⁴

The differences among Fei-Ch'ang-fang, Yen-tsung and Chih-k'ai are less trivial. (Fa-ching's doubts have been discussed above). However, it is obvious that Chih-k'ai's preface is a forgery.³⁵ Thus, the date in the preface is unreliable. Second, Yen-tsung never explicitly stated that AFM was translated during the Ch'en Dynasty. Yen-tsung simply regarded Paramārtha as a Ch'en Dynasty monk.³⁶

63. 楞伽經宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
64. 楞伽宗要論 (1), missing, T. 2183
65. 起信論別記 (1), extant, T. 1845
66. 起信論疏 (2), extant, T. 1844
67. 起信論宗要 (1), missing, T. 2184
68. 起信論大記 (1), missing, T. 2184
69. 起信論料簡 (1), missing, T. 2184
70. 起信論一道章 (1), missing, T. 2184
71. 起信論二障章 missing, Nara
72. 二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
73. 大乘二障義 (1), extant, WC, pp. 317-360
74. 金剛三昧經序 extant, WC, pp. 81-82
75. 金剛三昧經論 (6 or 3), extant, T. 1730,
vol. 34, p. 961
76. 金剛三昧經論疏 (3 or 6), missing, T. 2183
77. 金剛三昧經論記 (3), missing, Nara

Thirteenth group -- On the Pure Land sūtras

78. 無量壽經疏 (1 or 2), missing, T. 2184
79. 無量壽經私記 (1), missing, Chōsai (長西)
80. 兩卷無量壽經宗要 (1), extant, T. 1747, p. 125
81. 佛說阿彌陀經疏 (1), extant, T. 1759,
vol. 37, pp. 347f
82. 阿彌陀經義疏 (1), missing, Kōryū (興隆)
83. 阿彌陀經通贊疏 (1), missing, Bunyū (文雄)

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing
mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing
mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

142. See Park Chong-hong, Han'guk sasangsa, (Seoul: Sŏmundang, 1974), pp. 148-177.

143. See *ibid.*, pp. 178-232.

144. Even Professor Lee Chong-ik who wrote about Chinul for his doctoral dissertation in 1974 at Taishō University in Japan has not discussed the relationship between Wŏnhyo and Chinul.

145. "Pōjō Kuksa pimyŏng" or "The Inscription of National Master Pojo (Chinul)," written by Kim Kunsu in the thirteenth century, is the most detailed early record about Chinul but it does not yield any information about the relationship between Wŏnhyo and Chinul. Instead, it contains a lengthy description of the influence of Chinese monks on Chinul. See Kim Kunsu, "Pōjō Kuksa pimyŏng" in Pōjō pŏbŏ, translated by Kim T'anhŏ (Seoul: Pŏpŏwŏn, 1963), pp. 139-147.

146. See *ibid.*, p. 139b, line 11. See also Kim Chi-gyŏn, ed., Hwaŏmnon chŏryŏ (Tokyo: Seifū gakuen, 1968), p. 1, line 8.

147. It might be of interest here to point out that when Chinul did mention Wŏnhyo he always treated him as a representative of the scriptural study tradition and as a laymen. This is in marked contrast to Ŭich'ŏn's attitude towards Wŏnhyo. Both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul lived in the twelfth century, there being only fifty years

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Aśvaghōṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

the traditional Wŏnhyo and reconstruct a more accurate portrait of his life using not only the traditional information about him but also other known historical facts.

It is rather surprising that there is so much biographical material about Wŏnhyo, who lived in the early seventh century. The earliest record about him is the Kosŏnsa Sŏdang Hwasang t'appi 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑, or "The Inscription of Sŏdang Hwasang in Kosŏn Monastery."⁸⁵ Allegedly, this inscription was composed approximately one hundred years after Wŏnhyo's death in 686 A.D.⁸⁶ It remained unknown until it was discovered in a stream at Kyŏngju, Korea, in 1914. Unfortunately, when discovered, it was in several fragments with many illegible characters. Many scholars have tried to read the fragments,⁸⁷ but so far no one has been able to reconstruct the inscription except imperfectly. Thus, the best biographical sources about Wŏnhyo are still these two records,⁸⁸ which have always been esteemed by traditional scholars:

- (1) Tsan-ning 贊寧, "T'ang Hsin-lo-kuo Huang-lung-ssu Yüan-hsiao chuan" 唐新羅國黃龍寺元曉傳, included in the fourth roll of his Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳, ⁸⁹ which was presented to the emperor T'ai-tsung in 988 A.D.⁹⁰
- (2) Iryŏn 一然 (1206-1289 A.D.), "Wŏnhyo pulgi" 元曉不羈, included in the fourth roll of his Samguk yusa 三國遺事.⁹¹

It is odd that D.T. Suzuki chose the relatively unpopular translation by Śikṣānanda for his translation rather than the much more popular one by Paramārtha. Had Suzuki chosen to translate Paramārtha's version of AFM, his translation would undoubtedly be read by many people even today. As things stand, Hakeda's translation, which like Richards', Wai-tao's and Robinson's was made from Paramārtha's version, is the most widely read. However, Hakeda's translation has failed to bring out the meaning of the text in many places. This point will be dealt with in the second section of Part One. The rest of this introduction will be devoted to a review of the authenticity debate surrounding AFM, an issue first raised by Mochizuki Shinkō in 1902.¹⁸

The colophon of the Taishō edition of AFM, which is found immediately after the title, purports to give us some historical information concerning the author and translator of the text.¹⁹ It says,

馬鳴菩薩造 梁西印度
三藏法師 真諦譯

This may be translated:

Written by Bodhisattva Āśvaghoṣa,
translated during the Liang Dynasty
by the Western Indian Tripiṭaka
Dharma-master Paramārtha.

In his lifelong study of AFM, the Japanese Buddhologist Mochizuki Shinkō continually tried to prove the

Why this happened we do not know. However, it would explain why Fei Ch'ang-fang, Fa-ching, Tao-hsüan and Chih-sheng, who were otherwise so keen, should all have failed, first, to comment on the difference between the first and second rolls of Chan-ch'a ching and second, to explain why they considered the Chan-ch'a ching forged and AFM not, if the second roll of the former so resembled the latter. Although ours is admittedly an argument of probability, still, it is more probable than Mochizuki's.

Mochizuki's way of arguing reveals much about his way of thinking. Apparently, Mochizuki and his followers began by doubting the information contained in the colophon of the text. Why did they doubt it, when traditional scholars did not? Perhaps, as Ui Hakuju somewhat cynically pointed out, it was because of arrogance.⁴⁵ They contemptuously looked down upon the traditional scholars as being ignorant of the history of Buddhist doctrine, for it is impossible that Ásvaghoṣa, who lived before Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 A.D.), should have taught the Tathāgatagarbha theory, which did not appear until after Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu (320-400 A.D.). But one cannot help asking why Mochizuki could not entertain the possibility that the author of AFM was another Ásvaghoṣa, who lived after Vasubandhu. This is what Wŏnhyo apparently assumed. Mochizuki rejects this possibility by saying

line 28) and "wei-yu fa-ch'i ta-ch'eng ching-hsin 為欲
發起大衆淨信 " (p. 584a, line 29)).

D.T. Suzuki:

"...by the awakening of faith..." (line 28)

"For the purpose of awakening...
a pure faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 29)

Timothy Richards:

"get Faith in the Great School..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Wei Tao:

"by the Awakening of their Faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"...there is a way in which faith
in the Mahayana can be developed..." (line 16)

The Shrine of Wisdom:

"And faith in Mahāyāna cause the
Soul..." (line 15)

(no translation for line 16)

Y. Hakeda:

"...to give rise to the correct faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 15)

"There is a teaching (dharma) which
can awaken in us the root of faith
in the Mahayana..." (line 16)

R. Robinson:

"to awaken true faith in the Mahāyāna..."
(line 15)

"There is a dharma that can arouse the
roots of faith in the Mahāyāna..." (line 16)

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

that in classical Chinese rarely does a verb follow its object except in poetry, in which case rules of grammar are often neglected. Therefore, the most likely relationship between ta-ch'eng and ch'i-hsin is not that of a verbal phrase (ch'i-hsin) and its object (ta-ch'eng) but rather that of a qualifier (ta-ch'eng) and that which it qualifies (ch'i-hsin). According to this understanding of the title, the English translation of it would be Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith. The invocation with which the treatise begins immediately supports this understanding as its last line reads "ch'i ta-ch'eng cheng-hsin 起大乘正信 " or "awakening right Mahāyāna faith."⁵³

This line is again immediately followed by one like it, namely "yu-fa neng-ch'i mo-ho-yen hsin-ken 有法能起摩訶衍信根 "--"there is a principle which can arouse the root of Mahāyāna faith."⁵⁴ In these two lines the term "Mahāyāna" functions grammatically simply to qualify "faith;" there is not the slightest chance that "Mahāyāna" is to be taken as the object of "faith." Yet, all English translations, from D.T. Suzuki's to Yoshito Hakeda's, have "Mahāyāna" as the object of "faith."

The following are the various renditions of the two passages in question (T. 1666, p. 575b, lines 15-16). (D.T. Suzuki translated these two parallel passages from the T. 1667 version of the text: "ch'i-hsin 起信 " (p. 584a,

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i's brilliant exegetical works amply demonstrate the importance of the title in Buddhist scriptures. See T. 1716, vol. 33, pp. 681-814.

53. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b, line 15.

54. Ibid., line 16.

55. T. 2010, vol. 48, pp. 376b - 377a.

56. See D.T. Suzuki's translation, "On Believing in Mind" (Shinjin-no-Mei) in Manual of Zen Buddhism, (New York: Grove Press, 1960), pp. 76-82.

57. T. 2010, vol. 48, p. 377a, line 9.

58. Ibid.

59. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 575b - 583b.

60. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221b, line 22 - p. 221c, line 8.

61. T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

62. See AFM-H, pp. 92-102.

63. See T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 581c, line 7.

64. For the meaning of aniyata rāśi, see AFM-S pp. 114 and 127.

65. See AFM-H, p. 92. Brackets are Hakeda's.

66. See AFM-S, p. 128 and also T. 1667, vol. 32, p. 590a, lines 20-21.

67. See T. 1844, vol. 44, p. 221c, lines 3-4 and T. 1666, vol. 32, p. 578b, lines 23-24. See also Okamoto Sokō, "Shinri gainen no kōzō--Daijō kishin ron ni okeru", IBK 3-2, 1955, pp. 138-139.

- Itō Kazuo 伊藤和男. "Kishin ron ni okeru shinnyo no rikai" 起信論における眞如の理解, Nippon bukkyō gakkai nempo, vol. 14, 1942.
- Kamada Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. Chūgoku bukkyō shi kenkyū 中國佛教史研究. Shunjūsha, 1968.
- "Chūgoku zen shisō keisei no kyōgakuteki haikai--daijō kishin ron o chūshin toshite" 中國禪思想形成の教學的背景: 大乘起信論を中心として. Tōyō bunka kenkyūsho kiyō, vol. 49, 1969.
- Kametani Shōkkyō 亀谷聖馨. "Daijō kishin ron no sakusha ni tsuite" 大乘起信論の作者に就いて. Chūō Bukkyō, 4-6, 1920.
- Kanakuru Enshō 金倉圓照. Memyō no kenkyū 馬鳴の研究. Heirakuji shoten.
- "Memyō no shin. 馬鳴の信" Bunka, 18:3, 1954.
- Kashiwagi Hiroo 柏木弘雄. "Butten kaisetsu kōza, daijō kishin ron" 佛典解説講座, 大乘起信論. Bukkyō bunka, 3:1, 1971.
- Daijō kishin ron 大乘起信論. (Butten II of Sekai goten bungaku zenshu). Chikuba Shobō: Tokyo, 1965.
- "Daijō kishin ron no igi" 大乘起信論の意義. Tōyō gakujutsu kenkyū, 11:4, 1973.
- "Kishin ron chūshaku sho no keihu" 起信論 註釈書の系譜. Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 17:2, 1969.
- "Kishin ron ni kansuru ichi kosatsu" 起信論に關する一考察. Mikkyō bunka, vol. 52, 1961.
- "Kishin ron ni okeru shinjōju hosshin ni tsuite" 起信論における信成就発心について. Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 16:2, 1968.
- "Ko chūshakusho o tōshite mitaru kishin ron no senku shiso" 古註釋書を通じて見る起信論の先駆思想. Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 11:2, 1963.
- "Nyōrai zō no enki shiso" 如來藏の縁起思想. in Kōza tōyō shisō, vol. 5, Tokyo: Tōdai shuppan, 1967.
- "Shōmankyo to kishin ron" 勝鬘經と起信論, in Shōmankyo giso ronshū 勝鬘經義疏論集, ed. by Nippon Bukkyō Genryū Kenkyūkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1965.

- Kōno Hōun 河野法雲. "Kishin ron no ariyashiki ni tsuite" 起信論の阿梨耶識に就いて. Mujintō, 22:7, 1917.
- "Kishin ron no shoshū ni oyobosu eikyō" 起信論の諸宗に及ぼす影響. Rokujo gakuho, 89, 90, 92, 96, 1909.
- "Kishin ron shosetsu no ariyashiki to yuishikiron" 起信論所説の阿梨耶識と唯識論. Osaki gakuho, 23, 1970.
- "Kishin ron to yuishiki ron to no sōi" 起信論と唯識論との相違. Misshū gakuho, 12, 1914.
- Kōno Shigeo 河野重雄. "Daijō kishin ron ni okeru shujōshin ni tsuite" 大乘起信論における衆生心について Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 21:2, 1973.
- Kimura Takatarō 木村鷹太郎. "Bukkyō kishon no hihyo ni tsuki bukkyōto ni ni kotafu" 佛教起信の批評につき佛教徒に答ふ. Shūkyō, 31, 1894.
- Kitamura Kyōgon 北村教嚴. "Daijō kishin ron o yomu" 大乘起信論を読む. Tetsugaku zasshi, 17:184, 185, 1902.
- "Kishin ron no kunshu setsu" 起信論の熏習説. Shūkyō zasshi, 9:3,5, 1905.
- Kobayashi Jitsugen 小林実玄. "Kishin ron ni okeru nyoraizō no kaku, fukaku no mondai" 起信論に於ける如來藏の覚、不覚の問題. Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 12:2, 1964.
- Kumabe Jimmyō 隈部慈明. Ryōyaku taishō daijō kishin ron 兩訳対照大乘起信論. Hōzōkan, 1950.
- Daijō kishin ron seigi 大乘起信論精義. Hōzōkan, 1918.
- Maedo Eun 前田慧雲. "Daijō kishin ron no chōsha ni tsuiteno wudagai" 大乘起信論の著者に就いての疑. Tetsugaku zasshi, 17-180, 1902.
- "Kishin ron no ganku jōdo no dan to iko hon, tonohikaku" 起信論の勸歸淨土の段と易行品との比較. Rokujo gakuho, 100, 1910.
- Makida Tairyō 牧田諦亮. "Chūkoku bukkyō ni okeru gikyō kenkyū josetsu--donkō shutsuto gikyōrui o megutte" 中國佛教における疑經研究序説—敦煌出土疑經類をめぐって Tōhōgakuho, 35, 1954.

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

Chapter Four intended originally to convey, then it is very difficult to answer the question, How can I have this faith? But the inability to answer this question belies the opening remark of Chapter Four: "Here, for the sake of people who are still aniyata rāśi, how to practice faith is discussed." That is, can it be a reasonable answer to people asking how they can have faith to show only the result of having faith? Then Chapter Four would be nothing more than bait. However, it is highly unlikely that faith, or practice based on that faith, can successfully be awakened by bait. The question, How can I have this faith? must remain unanswered so long as one understands Chapter Four as Hakeda does. The only way to obviate this question and make the chapter meaningful in the context of the whole text is to retranslate the first part of the chapter, which is the part having to do with faith, based on the understanding we have developed so far. This is our translation of the first part of Chapter Four, which discusses the four faiths:

Briefly speaking, there are four faiths. What are the four? The first is to believe in the Ultimate Source, in other words [so wei 所謂], to be mindful, with the utmost willingness, of the principle of Suchness. The second is to believe that the Buddha has innumerable excellent virtues, in other words, to think always of being close to the Buddha, to make offerings to him, and to respect him. Furthermore, it means to awaken the capacity for goodness, which

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

thing) "each believing mind and Mind:"

hsin-hsin pu-erh 信心不二

"Where Mind and each believing mind are not divided."

pu-erh hsin-hsin 不二信心

"And undivided are each believing mind and Mind."

But in this poem the term hsin-hsin means simply "faith." It does not mean "believing in mind," and it certainly does not mean "Mind and each believing mind." In other words, hsin心 or "mind" does not serve as the object of hsin信 or "to believe." If one takes "mind" to be the object of "to believe" one completely misses the key point running throughout this poem, namely, that it is an error to admit any kind of duality in the practice of Buddhist faith.

2

The question as to whether or not Mahāyāna functions as the object of faith in AFM cannot be successfully resolved simply within the realm of grammatical investigation; it is necessary to know what is meant by faith in the text itself. In AFM the term hsin信 is used fifty-four times: four times in the Invocation; three times in the first chapter; twenty-two times in the third chapter; eighteen times in the fourth chapter; seven times in the last chapter. It does not occur at all in the second chapter. In order to examine in what senses the term

I. Introduction

AFM is sometimes referred to by its Sanskrit title Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra, which was reconstructed from the Chinese title, Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (大乘起信論); however, no Sanskrit version of the text has yet been discovered. In fact, no Indian text has mentioned even the name of the treatise. Moreover, no Tibetan translation exists, and no information about this treatise can be found from Tibetan sources, which are generally regarded as the best for information concerning the later Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts.¹⁵

There are two Chinese translations of AFM: the first is by Paramārtha in 550 A.D.; the second is by Śikṣānanda between 695 and 705 A.D. Most East Asian commentators, including Wŏnhyo, used the first translation.¹⁶

There have been five English translations of AFM. The first was D.T. Suzuki's in 1900 and the most recent is Yoshito Hakeda's in 1967. Of the three intervening translations, the two by Rev. Timothy Richards in 1907 and Ven. Wai-tao in 1937 are unreliable. The third, by Dr. Richard Robinson in 1960, is reliable but unpublished; it has been circulated only once among his friends and former students in mimeographed form.¹⁷

This idea is traceable back beyond Wŏnhyo to the Lao-tzu Tao-te ching and the early Ch'an masters of sixth century China.¹⁶⁸ But in Korea it was Wŏnhyo who first used this expression to describe Buddhist experience. This is not generally recognized.

Buddhism was introduced to Korea from China in the fourth century A.D. Korean Buddhism began with scriptural studies; by Wŏnhyo's time, during the Silla Dynasty, these studies had fully matured. At the end of the Silla Dynasty, the tradition of scriptural study was challenged by the newly imported Sŏn tradition. Therefore, the task that Buddhist leaders such as Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul faced during the Koryŏ Dynasty was reconciling the struggle between the two opposing traditions: scriptural studies and Sŏn meditation. In this situation, Wŏnhyo's theory of the harmonization of all disputes was again welcomed, by both Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul, after several hundred years of neglect. It is truly unfortunate that even today the doctrinal relationship between Wŏnhyo's Silla Buddhism and Ŭich'ŏn's and Chinul's Koryŏ Buddhism has not been completely examined by Korean scholars. One must carefully investigate the possibility whether or not Ŭich'ŏn and Chinul were practitioners of Wŏnhyo's theory of harmonization. This is one of the important tasks to be undertaken in the field of Korean Buddhist studies in the future.

- Kōno Hōun 河野法雲. "Kishin ron no ariyashiki ni tsuite" 起信論の阿梨耶識に就いて. Mujintō, 22:7, 1917.
- "Kishin ron no shoshū ni oyobosu eikyō" 起信論の諸宗に及ぼす影響. Rokujo gakuho, 89, 90, 92, 96, 1909.
- "Kishin ron shosetsu no ariyashiki to yuishikiron" 起信論所説の阿梨耶識と唯識論. Osaki gakuho, 23, 1970.
- "Kishin ron to yuishiki ron to no sōi" 起信論と唯識論との相違. Misshū gakuho, 12, 1914.
- Kōno Shigeo 河野重雄. "Daijō kishin ron ni okeru shujōshin ni tsuite" 大乘起信論における衆生心について Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 21:2, 1973.
- Kimura Takatarō 木村鷹太郎. "Bukkyō kishon no hihyo ni tsuki bukkyōto ni ni kotafu" 佛教起信の批評につき佛教徒に答ふ. Shūkyō, 31, 1894.
- Kitamura Kyōgon 北村教嚴. "Daijō kishin ron o yomu" 大乘起信論を読む. Tetsugaku zasshi, 17:184, 185, 1902.
- "Kishin ron no kunshu setsu" 起信論の熏習説. Shūkyō zasshi, 9:3,5, 1905.
- Kobayashi Jitsugen 小林実玄. "Kishin ron ni okeru nyōraizō no kaku, fukaku no mondai" 起信論に於ける如來藏の覚、不覚の問題. Indogaku bukkyō kenkyū, 12:2, 1964.
- Kumabe Jimmyō 隈部慈明. Ryōyaku taishō daijō kishin ron 兩訳対照大乘起信論. Hōzōkan, 1950.
- Daijō kishin ron seigi 大乘起信論精義. Hōzōkan, 1918.
- Maedo Eun 前田慧雲. "Daijō kishin ron no chōsha ni tsuiteno wudagai" 大乘起信論の著者に就いての疑. Tetsugaku zasshi, 17-180, 1902.
- "Kishin ron no ganku jōdo no dan to iko hon, tonohikaku" 起信論の勸歸淨土の段と易行品との比較. Rokujo gakuho, 100, 1910.
- Makida Tairyō 牧田諦亮. "Chūkoku bukkyō ni okeru gikyō kenkyū josetsu--donkō shutsuto gikyōrui o megutte" 中國佛教における疑經研究序説—敦煌出土疑經類をめぐって Tōhōgakuho, 35, 1954.

Disputes in Ten Chapters. The significance of this work will be discussed in the following section.

In fact, however, Paramārtha's career³⁷ spanned both the Liang and Ch'en Dynasties. Thus Yen-tsung's testimony cannot be used to date AFM. This leaves us with the date given by Fei Ch'ang-fang in his catalogue.

There is no good reason to doubt this date. Fei Ch'ang-fang's catalogue is innaccurate in some respects.³⁸ However, the information he gives about texts published around his own time are more reliable than anyone else's. Given this fact, and given the fact that the reason for the conflicting dates of translation can be explained, as has been shown, Mochizuki's doubts about the authorship of AFM may be regarded as groundless if based on the date issue.

Mochizuki's third reason is that the style and terminology of AFM are quite different from those of Paramārtha's other translations. Mochizuki points out that many elements found in AFM are not found from Indian texts, but imply a Chinese origin. Mochizuki also points out that, for example, whereas AFM uses the term hsiu to lo 修多羅 for sūtra, which was a favorite term of Daśabhūmika masters such as Bodhiruci, Paramārtha usually uses ching 經.³⁹ But this reason, too, is weak and unreflective.

But, while appearing everywhere, Wŏnhyo was spreading the practice of Yŏmbul (念佛).¹¹²

If the second story may be regarded as a temptation story, then the third story may be regarded as describing Wŏnhyo's practice and propagation of the remedy for people who, although attaining a kind of awakening, nevertheless allow their practice to be hindered by various obstacles. In short, the third story tells of Wŏnhyo's devotion to and spreading of faith in Amitābha Buddha.

The fact that Wŏnhyo wrote quite a few texts on Pure Land Buddhism, as well as his emphasis on Yŏmbul (念佛), a recitation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, as shown in works such as his Palshim suhaeng chang 發心修行章, and the fact that later Japanese Pure Land Buddhists respected Wŏnhyo as a patriarch of the Pure Land lineage,¹¹³ may be said to support our interpretation of the third story. In AFM, three steps in saving people are described.¹¹⁴ The first step is simply to state the fundamental principle of Mahāyāna Buddhism, that the mind of all sentient beings is the matrix of Tathāgata, which it discusses in Chapters One, Two, and Three. The second step is to practice faith, i.e., to believe in Suchness, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, which it discusses in the first part of the fourth chapter. The third step is to recite the name of Amitābha Buddha, which it discusses in the

-----"Das mahāyānistische Absolutum nach der Lehre der Mādhyamikas." OLZ, (1935), pp. 401-415.

Stcherbatsky, Th. et Obermiller, E., ed. and trans. Abhisamayālaṅkāra-prajñāpāramitaupeśa-śāstra. BB, XXIII (1929).

Stcherbatsky, Th. "The Dharmas of the Buddhist and the 'Gūṇas' of the Sāṃkhyas." IHQ, X (No. 4), pp. 737-760.

Suzuki (Mrs.), Beatrice Erskine Lane. "An outline of the Avatamsaka Sutra." EB, VL, pp. 279.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitarō. Açvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna (Daijōkishinron). Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1900.

-----Die buddhistische Psychologie bei Açvaghosha. Exposé aus Açvaghosha's Mahāyāna çradđhotpādaçastra. BWr, Jg. II (1908-1911), pp. 36-46, 161-164.

-----"The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, as a Mahāyāna text in special relation to the teaching of Zen Buddhism." EB, IV, (Oct. 1927-March 1928), pp. 199-298.

-----"Notes on the Avatamsaka Sūtra." EB, I (1921-1922), pp. 233-236.

-----"Philosophy of the Yogācāra. The Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra." Muséon, (New Series), V (1904), pp. 370-386.

-----Studies in the Laṅkāvatārasūtra, one of the most important texts of Mahayana Buddhism, in which all its principle tenets are presented, including the teaching of Zen. London: George Routledge, 1930.

Tamaki, Kōshirō. "The development of thought of Tathāgatagarbha from India to China." IBK, 9 (Jan. 1961), pp. 386-378 (pagination follows that of Japanese text).

Thurman, Robert A.F., trans. The Holy Teaching of Vimalakīrti. University Park, Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.

Tucci, G. "Notes on Laṅkāvatāra." IHQ, IV (No. 3, 1928).

Unno, Taitetsu. "The Buddhātā theory of Fatsang." International Conference of Orientalists in Japan. Transactions no. 8 (1963), pp. 34-41.

- Wai Tao. "Awakening of Faith," included as a section in A Buddhist Bible, ed. by Dwight Goddard. Beacon Press, 1938.
- Wayman, Alex. "A Report on the Śrāvaka-Bhūmi and its Author (Asaṅga)." JBRs, XLII (Nos. 3-4, 1956), pp. 316-329.
- "The Rules of Debate according to Asaṅga." JAOS, 78 (1958), pp. 29-40.
- Wei Tat, trans. Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun: The Doctrine of Mere Consciousness. Hong Kong: The Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun Publication Committee, 1973.
- Weinstein, Stanley. "The Concept of Ālayavijñāna in pre-Tang Chinese Buddhism." Bukkyō Shisō Ronshū, Tokyo, 1964, pp. 35-40.
- Yamada, James S. "The Tathāgata-garbha and the collective unconscious: a two-fingered approach to Zen." IBK, 3 (whole No. 6, March 1955), pp. 765-760.
- Yung Hsi. Buddhism and the Chan School of China. Trans. by Chou Hsiang-Kuang; Indo-Chinese Literature Series, Allahabad, 1956.

IV. REFERENCE WORKS CITED

- Chang Sam-shik 張三植, Tae han-han sajon
大漢韓辭典, Seoul: Sungmunsa, 1965.
- Chih-sheng 智昇, K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu 開元釋教錄
(T. 2154, vol. 55).
- Dainihon kōtei shukusatsu daizōkyō, 大日本校訂
縮刷大藏經. Tokyo: Kōkyo shoin, 1880-1885.
- Dainihon zokuzōkyō 大日本續藏經. Kyoto: Zōkyō
shoin, 1905-1912.
- Fa-ching 法經, Chung-ching mu-lu 衆經目錄 (T. 2145,
vol. 55).
- Fei Ch'ang-fang 費長房, Li-tai san-pao chi 歷代三寶紀
(T. 2034, vol. 49).
- Giles, Herbert A., A Chinese-English Dictionary, Taipei:
Ch'eng-wen Publishing Company, 1967.
- Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme
d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises, Tokyo:
Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1929-1931.
- Iryōn 一然, Samguk yusa 三國遺事 (T. 2039, vol. 49).
- Ishida, ed., Narachō genzai issaikyōso mokuroku, Tōyō
bunko, 1930. 石田「奈良朝現在一切經疏目錄」
- Kakhun 覺訓, Haedong kosūng chōn 海東高僧傳 (T. 2065,
vol. 50).
- Kim Yong-t'ae et al. 金煥泰, Han'guk pulgyosa 韓國
佛教史, Seoul: Chinsudang, 1970.
- Koryo taejanggyong 高麗大藏經, Photo-reprint,
Seoul: Dongguk University, 1976.
- Mizuno Kogen 水野弘元 et al., Shin butten kaidai jiten
新佛典解題辭典, Tokyo: 1955-1960.
- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, Bukkyō daijiten 佛教
大辭典, Tokyo: 1960-1963.
- Mok Chōng-bae 睦貞培 et al., Wōnhyo chōnjip 元曉全集,
Seoul: Pulgyohak ton'inhoe, 1973.

Morohashi Tetsuji 榎橋轍次, Daikanwaijiten 大漢和
辭典, Tokyo: 1955-1960.

Motoi Nobuo 本井信雄, "Shiragi Gangyō no denki ni
tsuite" 新羅元曉の傳記について
Ōtani gakuhō, XLI, No. 1 (1961), pp. 33-52.

Nanjio Bunyiu, A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the
Buddhist Tripitaka, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1883.

Nukariya Kaiten 忽滑谷快天, Chōsen zenkyōshi 朝鮮禪教史,
Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1930.

Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙, Bussho Kaisetsu daijiten 佛書
解説大辭典, Tokyo: Daitō shuppan sha, 1931-1936.

Seng-yu 僧祐, Ch'u san-tsang-chi chi 出三藏記集, (T. 2146,
vol. 55).

Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku 昭和法寶總目錄, Tokyo: Daizō
shuppan kabushiki kaisha, 1929. (This comprises the
last three volumes of the Taishō Tripitaka.)

Soothill, W. E., and Hodous, Lewis, A Dictionary of Chinese
Buddhist Terms, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner
& Co., 1937.

Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經, Tokyo:
Daizō shuppan kabushiki kaisha, 1924-1934.

Takahashi Tōru 高橋亨, Richō bukkyō 李朝佛教,
Tokyo: Hōbunkan, 1929.

Tsan-ning 贊寧, Sung Kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳 (T. 2061,
vol. 50).

Yi Nūng-hwa 李能和, Chosŏn pulgyo t'ongsa 朝鮮
佛教通史, Seoul: Sinmunkwan, 1918.

Ūich'ŏn 義天, Shinpyŏn chejong Kyojang Ch'ongnok
新編諸宗教藏總錄 (T. 2184, vol. 55).

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, Shoki Zenshū shisho no
kenkyū 初期禪宗史書の研究,
Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967.